

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 992

RC 010 177

AUTHOR Hecht, Kathryn A.; Fox, Robert M.
TITLE Leadership Programs and Alaska Native Perspectives: A Study to Promote University Awareness.
INSTITUTION Alaska Univ., Fairbanks. Center for Northern Educational Research.
PUB DATE Apr 77
NOTE 64p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Activities; *Alaska Natives; Criteria; Educational Alternatives; Fellowships; Financial Support; *Interviews; *Leadership; *Literature Reviews; *Needs Assessment; Program Coordination; Program Development; *Program Planning; Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS *University of Alaska

ABSTRACT

Information for planning a university-sponsored Alaska Native leadership program was derived from a literature review and a review of leadership programs outside Alaska coupled with in-depth interviews with identified Native leaders (N=10 from a list of 90). Among the kinds of programs examined were: a leadership development program; the cultural aspects of educational leadership programs; education policy program; White House fellowships; a national urban fellows program; city-university educational leadership programs; and an American Indian education leadership program. Questions addressed in the interviews included: the educational and work background of the interviewees; the need for Native leaders; characteristics of leaders and potential leaders; obstacles to entering a leadership program; recruiting candidates; application procedures; academic criteria; age limits; candidate interviews; planning the program; program content; group and individual activities; timing and duration; and other selection and program suggestions. Major recommendations for program planning were: pay special attention to the cross-cultural aspects of Native leadership; institute leadership programs on a pilot basis to allow for testing alternatives; make the program flexible enough to account for the needs/backgrounds of the participants; include a well-coordinated mix of individual experiences and group learning; include a credit and/or degree option; coordinate with other programs; and obtain funds from several sources to insure stability.
(JC)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

rec 25-11-77

ED145992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Leadership Programs and Alaska Native Perspectives: A Study to Promote University Awareness

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Kathryn A. Hecht for
Center for Northern Edu
Research*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM.

by
**Kathryn A. Hecht
Robert M. Fox**

Center for Northern Educational Research
University of Alaska • Fairbanks • 1977

2010177

Lewis Meriam in 1928 called on the federal government to develop programs which would train Indians for leadership positions in their community. Practically every U.S. president since that time has made the same comment. Very little, if anything, happened until Indians themselves made a decision to assume full responsibility for improving the life of their people. Nearly fifty years have passed and the nation is observing the greatest upheaval of Indian self determination ever. It is the Indian people themselves who are leading. The potential of highly skilled and competent Indian leadership is obviously there and if Indians are content to listen to rhetoric during the next 50 years, the human waste will be unbearable.

Antell, W., "Introduction," in
*Indian Educational Leadership:
A Conference Report* (October 2-5,
1973.) W. Antell and P. Linch,
editors. New Mexico State
University, University Park, March
1975. ERIC Document Reproduction
Service, ED 104 588.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
Foreword	vii
Overview of the Report	ix
Introduction	1
 I. Looking Outside Alaska: Learning From Experiences of Other Leadership Programs	 3
Literature Review	3
In-Depth Look at Selected Programs	4
The Leadership Development Program	5
Cultural Aspects of Educational Leadership Program	8
Education Policy Fellowship Program	11
White House Fellowships	14
National Urban Fellows Program	16
City-University Educational Leadership Programs	17
American Indian Education Leadership Development Program	19
 II. Looking within Alaska: Interviews With Selected Native Leaders	 23
Procedures	23
Summary of the Interviews	23
Educational Background of Those Interviewed	23
Work History of Those Interviewed	24
Need for Native Leaders	25
Characteristics of Leaders and Potential Leaders	25
Obstacles to Entering a Leadership Program	26
Recruiting Candidates	26
Application Procedures	27
Academic Criteria	28
Age Limits	28
Candidate Interviews	29
Other Selection Suggestions	29
Planning the Program	30
Program Content: Coursework and Internships	30
Group and Individual Activities	32
Other Program Suggestions	32
Timing and Duration	33
Funding	33
Summary	34
Epilogue	34
 III. Planning Leadership Programs for Alaska Natives and Others: Summary and Recommendations	 36
Summary	36
Recommendations	36
Need for a Leadership Program	36
Model Programs	37
Program Structure: Need for Flexibility	37
Program Name	37
Program Goals: Community/Career	37
The Participants	38
Community Involvement	38

p. 10 blank

Recruitment Strategy	38
Application and Selection	39
Commitment	39
Project Staff	39
The Program: Individual and Group Experiences	39
Opportunity to Apply Learning	40
Internship	40
Selecting Internships	40
Participant/Mentor Match	41
Internships: Single or Multiple Placement	41
Cross-Cultural Experience	41
Credit	41
Coordination of Program Components	42
Coordination With Other Programs	42
Evaluation	42
Program Cost	43
Group Spirit	43
Participant Input	43
Post-Program Activities	43
Post-Program Placement	44
Final Note	44
Appendices	45
A. List of Persons Who Contributed to the Study	47
B. Selected Leadership Programs and Program Directories	48
C. Interview Schedule and Initial Contact Letter	54

FOREWORD

Alaska Native people have only recently become involved in business and public administration activities affecting the lives of Native people. Recently passed civil rights and equal employment laws have opened up business and governmental opportunities which were unknown to Native people fifteen years ago. In addition, the Native land settlement has created hundreds of administrative and literally thousands of policy-board positions which will be filled largely by Native people.

It seems likely that Native people will continue to move into key leadership positions in the Alaskan business and governmental communities at least until they approach parity with the rest of the Alaskan population. While Native participation can be (and is) mandated, effective participation requires a wide range of skills. Every opportunity to further develop those skills should be carefully considered.

It is sometimes said that "leadership" is an indefinable quality which cannot be gained through training. While that may be true, it seems that some decision-making skills can be enhanced through participation in sound, well-organized educational programs. Leadership training is certainly not a panacea for the new administrative needs now confronting Native people, but it is one means by which public educational institutions can effectively become involved in the development of capabilities which must now take place in the Alaska Native community.

The record, to date, indicates that the University of Alaska's response to Native needs has been less than adequate. If the University should decide, through a leadership program, to address the administrative training needs of the Native community, I would hope that it would be a well-planned, high-quality effort. Without a commitment to excellence, such a program cannot be worthwhile.

Dennis Demmert
Director, Native Studies
University of Alaska

Overview of the Report

The goal of our study was to provide information for planning a University-sponsored Alaska Native leadership program by:

Reviewing leadership development programs outside Alaska.

Interviewing influential Natives within Alaska.

(See Introduction for detail.)

Here are samples of what we learned from studying programs "outside":

A review of the literature on leadership development programs did not uncover a significant body of materials for use by persons undertaking initiation of such programs.

Leadership programs are seldom evaluated in an effective way which would allow for program self-improvement and dissemination of promising practices to others.

In programs reviewed, applications far outnumber places available—competition is keen. Sound recruitment and selection processes are critical to a program's success.

Most programs combine group, academic-type experiences with individually tailored work or internship experiences in a variety of ways. The key to any combination of experiences is coordination.

Some programs offer a credit or academic degree option. There is no agreement on whether or not this is beneficial or essential to a leadership program.

Funding for leadership programs usually comes from Federal and state governments or foundations. Lack of funding certainty is often a problem.

(See Chapter I for detail.)

Here are samples of what Alaska Natives told us:

The availability of qualified, young, aggressive leaders is at a premium There is a real need in this state for qualified Natives in finance and business administration . . . the leadership quality of women is not being used as much as it should be

I think if there were a chance for people from places like Anaktuvuk Pass, or some of the very small villages to participate in a program like this, and then go back to the villages and in some way provide the leadership that is needed, it would be good.

I would advise combining course work and internship/work experience The program must have a place for the graduate to go exercise the skills they learned . . . so many times Indians take courses, and we don't ever get a thank you, let alone compensation or credit

In its initial phase, the Native leadership program should try to turn out a few good leaders in the areas most needed by Native corporations.

Any University-sponsored program must have a revised philosophy about Natives. The program should not try to make Natives like whites. The University must realize that

many ethnic cultures can live side-by-side in a society, with each retaining its cultural integrity

A lot of people, Native people, will have difficulty with the term 'leadership.' I just think that most Native people are unassuming, so the term itself may be a little bit of a problem.

(See Chapter II for detail.)

Here are samples of our recommendations:

In developing any leadership program, special attention should be paid to the cross-cultural aspects of Native leadership.

Leadership programs should be first instituted on a pilot basis to allow for the testing of various alternatives. Resources and time for planning and evaluation are essential.

Any program should be flexible enough to take into account the needs and backgrounds of the participants. However, Goals and intents should be clearly stated.

A leadership program should include a well-coordinated mix of individual experiences and group learning. Internship opportunities should be well planned and monitored. For group activities, both standard courses and special seminars should be considered.

A University-sponsored leadership program should include a credit and/or degree option.

Coordination with other leadership development programs should be considered.

Programs should be "cost-realistic" and obtain funds from several sources to insure stability.

(See Chapter III for detail.)

We also included limited information on available leadership programs of possible interest to persons living in Alaska. This resource material can be found in Appendix B.

INTRODUCTION

The goals of the study which led to this report were to encourage persons both within and outside the University to focus efforts on meeting Alaska Native leadership needs, and to assist the future planning of leadership development programs by providing a useful information base and suggested program directions.

This report provides several types of information: (1) a general review of the literature and descriptions of several leadership programs outside Alaska, concentrating on what can be learned from the experience of others; (2) comments by Alaska Native leaders as to what such a program in Alaska should consider; and, (3) the researchers' conclusions and recommendations, based on (1) and (2). The appended portions include additional information on leadership programs available outside which might be of interest to Alaskans.

Although they are not addressed directly in the study, the principal investigator took into consideration two background factors in designing this project: first, dramatic increases in the need for Native leaders; and second, the new rural/Native thrust of the University of Alaska. Native leaders are needed to fill new roles in the regional and village corporations created by the 1971 Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, on school boards and in school district positions brought about by the recent emergence of 21 rural regional school districts, and in related agency and corporate enterprises tied closely to Alaska's economic boom and rapid social change. This factor was taken as a given in this study, having been repeatedly discussed, documented, and generally accepted by most Alaskans in the past several years.¹

Coupled with the recognized need for increased numbers of Native leaders was the recently expressed commitment of the University of Alaska to place increased emphasis on meeting the needs of rural Alaskans and to become more responsive and flexible, as demonstrated by the creation of the office of the Vice-President for Rural Educational Affairs.²

This study was not to be concerned with philosophical or psychological arguments concerning leadership characteristics. "Leadership" as a generally accepted construct or commonly used term was intended to suggest or describe those who occupy legitimate decision-making or policy-setting roles, and who have the regard and trust of their respective communities. The fact that different people may have varying interpretations of leadership was not considered a problem for the purpose of this study. However, several of the Natives interviewed for the study felt the term "leader" was not compatible with Native culture and that some alternative name for a program should be considered.

Dr. Kathryn A. Hecht, Associate Professor of Education, Center for Northern Educational Research (CNER), was the principal investigator for the study. She was assisted by Robert M. Fox, graduate student researcher, who was responsible for the interviews portion of the study. Assistance was also received from Janet G. Burke, who compiled the appendix on selected leadership programs and directories, Ruth Glavinovich, who edited the manuscript, Dorothy Smith, who typed many drafts, and from other CNER staff members who offered suggestions throughout the project. The authors wish to thank those individuals, too numerous to mention here, who assisted in the planning and carrying out of this project by reviewing the proposal, nominating Native leaders,

¹See for example:

Alaska Native Foundation, *Higher and Adult Educational Needs in Rural Alaska*, Anchorage, 1974.

Darnell, F., Hecht, K., and Orvik, J., *Prehigher Education in the Unorganized Borough: Analysis and Recommendations*, Fairbanks: University of Alaska, Center for Northern Educational Research, 1974.

Kleinfeld, J., Jones, P., and Evans, R., *Land Claims and Native Manpower*, Fairbanks: Alaska Native Foundation and University of Alaska, Institute of Social, Economic, and Government Research, 1973.

Kohout, K., and Kleinfeld, J., *Alaska Natives in Higher Education*, Fairbanks: University of Alaska, Institute of Social, Economic, and Government Research, 1974.

²Hecht, K., "ANHRDP and the University: Influence Towards Change," Mini-Evaluation Report No. 4, Alaska Native Human Resources Development Program, Fairbanks: University of Alaska, Center for Northern Educational Research, October, 1975.

supplying information, and consenting to be interviewed.³ Cooperation willingly given by so many people further encouraged the researchers in this effort. All who so assisted will receive a copy of the report. Their comments, as well as those of other reader/users, are encouraged.

This research planning project was funded through a grant from Title I Higher Education Act Federal funds, as administered through the Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education, and by CNER. The Alaska Native Human Resource Development Program provided financial assistance towards the publication of the report.

³See Appendix A for a list of persons who contributed to this study.

I. LOOKING OUTSIDE ALASKA: LEARNING FROM EXPERIENCES OF OTHER LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS

Literature Review

A brief review of the literature, including an ERIC computer search, failed to turn up a significant body of literature which described and/or evaluated leadership programs.

Although individual leadership programs generally had brochures which briefly described their programs, more in-depth or analytical information seldom was presented in widely disseminated sources such as scholarly publications or journals. A few exceptions to this included a critical article on the elite White House Fellows program⁴ and an historic piece on the Appalachian-based Highlander Folk School.⁵ Only one instance of a published descriptive/evaluative report of a leadership program was located; that project was funded federally and the evaluation was part of a final contract report.⁶

Similarly, little descriptive information was available on leadership programs collectively. One recent response to this information need was a series of directories on internship experiences issued by the National Center for Public Service Internship Programs (see Appendix B).

The only related type of leadership programs on which substantial information was found was the internship. Such information was often in the form of guidelines, such as the article "Designing and Operating a Productive Intern Program" which discussed key elements for operating an intern program in a foundation setting.⁷ One refreshing variation of the guideline approach was an evaluation handbook published by Executive High School Internships of America (1975) for its participating districts; it appears to be a unique and useful type of publication, although the results of its application were unknown.⁸

Unfortunately, the same lack of in-depth descriptive and program evaluative information as found for leadership programs in general also was found to apply in the more specific and better publicized area of internships. The National Center for Public Service Internship Programs recently published a report on administrative issues and problems of public service internships.⁹ Rosenbaum, in introducing the report, emphasized this surprising shortage of information:

Despite the quite remarkable growth of both student and institutional interest in internship programs, there is still comparatively little hard information about such basic questions as how best to organize such activity or its consequences in terms of educational benefits. The fact is that while a lot has been written about internships, too much of it is limited to public relations type descriptions seemingly borrowed from the annual reports published by program directors. Recently this has begun to be supplemented, however, by a slightly more dispassionate body of observational literature . . . For the most part, however, this is a literature that is still almost entirely dependent upon the more or less impressionistic accounts . . . there is

⁴Rand, P., "Collecting Merit Badges: The White House Fellows," *The Washington Monthly*, June, 1976, pp. 47-56.

⁵Adams, F., "Highlander Folk School: Getting Information, Going Back and Teaching It," *Harvard Education Review*, November, 1972, 42:4, pp. 497-520.

⁶Schindler, P., *A Sociological Case Study and Assessment of the Six City-University Educational Leadership Programs*, Washington, D.C.: Institute of Educational Leadership, George Washington University, 1973 [OEG-0-9-426010-2461 (725)].

⁷McAdam, T. and Lyon, H., "Designing and Operating a Productive Intern Program," *Foundation News*, July/August, 1975, pp. 43-47.

⁸*Evaluating the Executive High School Internships Program*, New York: Executive High School Internships of America, Academy for Educational Development, 1975.

⁹Rosenbaum, A., *Public Service Internships and Education in Public Affairs: Administrative Issues and Problems*, Washington, D.C.: National Center for Public Service Internship Programs, 1976.

*nevertheless almost a total absence of objective, empirically validated data regarding such matters.*¹⁰

The researcher then stated that the report had not overcome all of these faults in that it also had not been based on systematic data collection, but it did described several programs in depth and did analyze key problem areas as well as make recommendations.

Farquhar and Piele, in a substantial review of literature on educational administrator preparation programs, also found few attempts to evaluate program content and suggested that either evaluations had not been conducted or, if conducted, had not been reported.¹¹

In the following section, which reports the results of having looked at the experiences of a few leadership programs in detail, the principal investigator found both of these suggested reasons for lack of readily available evaluation information to be true. Most programs were not evaluated at all, and in those that were, the evaluation was not systematic nor ongoing for the duration of the program. In instances where evaluative information was collected and analyzed, such information was not published or publicly available. The charge made by Farquhar and Piele in their review of administrative preparation—"... those conducting the evaluations have neglected the important responsibility of making their research known"—is strongly supported by this report as extended to include the entire field of leadership training programs.¹²

IN-DEPTH LOOK AT SELECTED PROGRAMS

As stated in the research proposal submitted to the Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education:

In order to build upon previous related learning, the contractor will review the experiences of well-established programs elsewhere which have, as a priority, the training of native peoples for increased leadership capacity by widening their scope of experience. Two such programs have already been identified: Ford Foundation's Leadership Development Program and the East-West Center's Professional Development Program in Cultures in Contact. These two programs have been selected because they represent very different approaches: (1) an individual experience with minimal guidance and interaction between participants; and (2) a highly structured university-based group workshop. Another factor in their selection is more practical, in that CNER has already had informal contact with some organizers and participants from each of these programs, and both groups have had at least minimal involvement in Alaska. If at all possible, a third such program will be identified during the project.¹³

Prior to actually contacting the programs noted above, the principal investigator reviewed the available literature (see previous section). A list of factors considered critical to developing and implementing a leadership program was identified to guide the process of reviewing the selected programs. The following outline of subjects to be discussed resulted:

¹⁰Rosenbaum, pp. 1-2.

¹¹Farquhar, R., and Piele, P., *Preparing Educational Leaders: A Review of Recent Literature*, Columbus: University Council for Educational Administration, 1972, (ED 069 014).

¹²Farquhar and Piele, p. 14.

¹³Hecht, K., "University-Sponsored Leadership Program for Alaska Natives," a proposal to the Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education, Fairbanks: University of Alaska, Center for Northern Educational Research, June, 1975.

Leadership Programs: Guide to Reviewing Programs

1. Brief history and goals (specific objectives)
2. Recruitment/Application/Selection (method, type of person)
3. Program activities (type, location, length of time)
4. Evaluation (program, individual)
5. Major changes in program over time (information base)
6. Cost
7. Spinoffs (direct or indirect, follow up)
8. Publications/reports on this program
9. Other factors to consider
10. Other programs to review

During the course of the study year, the principal investigator spoke with several people monitoring or administering the Ford Foundation's Leadership Development Program and the East-West Center's Cultural Aspects of Educational Leadership Program. She met with administrators of these two programs on location and reviewed and/or collected the available documentary material. In addition, the following programs were also visited and/or reviewed from literature, and more limited information on them will also be presented: Education Policy Fellowship Program, Whitehouse Fellowships, National Urban Fellows Program, City-University Educational Leadership Programs of the Education Professions Development Act, and American Indian Leadership Development Program.

(Note: Information on the programs described in this section was collected during a 14-month period [August 1975 - September 1976]. All programs were discussed in past tense, as the information was reported as the researcher found it during the project year. More current information was added up to the time the report went to press. Some of the programs were well established and were expected to be continued for several years at least, while some, as noted in the narrative, had already been discontinued. Therefore, for the most up-to-date information on specific programs, the reader should write to the contacts noted in Appendix B.)

The Leadership Development Program

The Leadership Development Program (LDP) sponsored by the Ford Foundation has been in existence for ten years and has cost more than ten million dollars. The most recent available document which enumerated participants (1975) noted that there have been 536 fellowships for young men and women chiefly from rural areas in 34 states and Canada. Of these fellows, 205 were white, 161 black, 118 chicano, and 51 native Americans, with 362 men and 174 women selected. Given the magnitude of the LDP effort, this report attempts to highlight those program factors identified as most interesting and pertinent, and to describe the changes which have occurred during the program's history.

The principal investigator spoke with the Foundation's program officer, a regional director, and an evaluation consultant for the program. All written materials on this project, including evaluations, were considered to be the Foundation's internal working documents and were not publicly available, although the Foundation source shared them willingly. As a recent Foundation document stated, the LDP story, why and how it developed, what it has done or not done, and the like, should be told. The report went on to say that Foundation staff members who had been involved in LDP through the years were currently making plans for an assessment and history of the project. (According to a Foundation source, this work recently has been commissioned to David Nevin, a journalist formerly with *Life* magazine. The report on LDP is scheduled for publication by summer of 1977.)

Between 1966 and 1973, the LDP program was administered directly by the Foundation through four regional offices. According to an internal document, its stated purpose was:

... building cadres of future leaders committed to reforming rural education, at the same time achieving minority equality in schools... using non-traditional field-based individually designed fellowships.

In 1973, the decision was made to separate the LDP program from direct Ford administration. Three grants then were made to regional organizations to administer similar programs in the southeast, southwest and Appalachia, plus a recent additional program for Indians in the southwest. (Ford soon will be phasing out funding of all such programs; if the programs are to continue, they will do so only through other funding.)

A unique aspect of the program was that it selected persons who had already demonstrated some leadership qualities in their local schools or communities, but it excluded persons already in positions of recognized authority. The program therefore was designed to tap leadership potential with the hope that the fellowship experience would help participants to improve education in the rural areas where they worked and lived. The fellowship experience was intended to broaden personal and professional outlooks through exposure to different people and programs in different settings.

Fellows received support for up to 12 months and were expected to consider the grant a full-time commitment. Each fellow, working through a regional program officer, planned a personal program combining such activities as apprenticeships, travel, visits to projects, work experience, independent study, research and writing. They usually undertook little if any formal academic study. Personal growth was the program's primary concern, although it was expected that the community and region eventually should benefit as well. It was not the program's intent to assist the fellows to move out of their regions nor was it designed to encourage fellows to select significantly different careers.

Potential participants applied through regional representatives (later regional programs) and were asked to write narratives describing their background, interests, personal goals and evidence of experience which would qualify them for the program. No standard application form was used, with one regional exception. They were also asked to specify what they would like to do during their program year, although no definite decisions were made at this stage. In fact, individual program plans were changed continuously throughout the fellowship year. Finalists were interviewed by a selection committee; although before 1970, interviews had been conducted solely by Ford representatives.

In reviewing the internal evaluation reports which covered only the early years of the program, and talking to the evaluation consultant, Douglas Derrer, who wrote them, the following comments were noted: persons who were most sought-after for such a program were those least likely to apply; and many people in high-level positions applied who were considered over-qualified and not the target of the project. In the evaluator's words, the program was "looking for those people who wouldn't apply." He added that the written applications by the potential fellows were not very useful because people tended to write what they thought the program required. He thought interviews were a far more important selection tool.

In terms of selection, the best indicator seemed to be the present leadership activity the person was exhibiting in a community. In this project, as in several others reviewed, it was said that those who were selected had to be expected to qualify for the program and seemed most surprised to be selected.

The evaluator felt that those who had received the award needed guidance in planning their individual year's experience; that they had difficulty dealing with the amount of freedom and almost limitless options. He felt the best-administered regional programs included a finite set of activity choices, made available to be developed into individually tailored composites, which allowed each fellow to try out a variety of personal and professional experiences.

The amount of travel a fellow did was thought by the evaluator to be a prime factor in program success and was related to a broadening of experience and an increase of self-confidence.¹⁴

¹⁴An administrator of the program cautioned that this generalization did not always hold true and that extensive travel did cause loss of credibility and severe problems in adjusting to different life styles in some cases.

This was also true of the number of placements a participant had during the year, more placements generally being better than few. The best age for fellows seemed to be 30.

The evaluator suggested that among weaknesses of the program was a lack of emphasis on implementation skills. Fellows knew what they wanted to do but not how to do it, and, in many cases, did not get that type of practice during the year. He also noted that some of the fellows' needs could best be handled by group learning and sharing of experiences such as through workshops in community sociology and culture change.

Early evaluation reports described a lapse in time in seeing the results of program participation. A possible reason suggested was the difficulty fellows encountered in reentering and reestablishing themselves within their communities. The least successful fellowship experiences seemed to occur for those who had no contact with their home communities during the fellowship year. They found adjustment to returning home difficult and experienced alienation from their communities. The evaluator felt that fellows should have kept in contact with their home communities and that one year might be a too-lengthy training period. He added that individual development would happen anyway, but that there was a need to emphasize the importance of the tie with the community to the fellow's program or of some other form of accountability. He also suggested that fellows be told that the program was not only for them but for what they would do when they returned home.

Several times during this study the issue of credentialing was mentioned. In this program, the evaluator felt there might be some value in helping fellows receive university credit for their fellowship time without making it predominantly an academic program. (He noted one regional grantee is now looking into this possibility.) Another issue which was mentioned in this evaluation as well as in others was a felt desire among participants in the program for continued contact after the fellowship experience. (No information was available on how this recommendation had been acted upon, although it is known that some small post-fellowship grants were made available.)

The evaluator emphasized the need for an evaluation process to be more comprehensive and structured than it had been in this program; and that the evaluative reports which were prepared on LDP were not as useful as they might have been had they been used more directly to influence later policy decisions. He felt that there should be a way of formalizing reporting to a decision-making group to assure the consideration of evaluative information in replanning the program. Also, in this program, fellows did not participate in decision-making on any formal basis, although they were sometimes put on regional selection committees and did have informal influence during semi-annual meetings.

The program changed in a number of ways since its inception and some of these changes appeared to reflect on the opinions of the evaluator noted above. For instance, in the internal document supporting the proposed grant for an Appalachian program, four factors were revealed as problems specific to the region, yet they seem indicative of problems within the total program: (1) the reluctance of some community leaders to leave their communities for up to a year in order to participate in the program, (2) relative lack of accountability by the fellow to his or her community, (3) lack of program mechanisms which would allow fellows to share ideas and experiences periodically with other fellows, and (4) reentry problems when fellows attempted to return to communities at the end of the fellowship year.

The Appalachian pilot program addressed these problem areas in several ways. It tested the value of community selection in identifying worthwhile candidates, thereby increasing the fellows' accountability and responsibility to community and region. The program also included workshop participation for all fellows dealing with community issues, rather than the strictly individual program as had characterized LDP in the past. The length of the program was no longer strictly for one year: in this region it ranged from just workshop participation to six months. It also was noted that more recent programs attempted to get a better mixture of older and younger people. (According to a Foundation source, these changes were not all effective and in some aspects this particular program now has swung back towards the earlier LDP model.)

As mentioned above, projects now run by grantees soon will be phased out. The LDP type of individual program was very expensive. In discussions at the Foundation, this investigator was told that as the Foundation views itself, one of its purposes is to develop programs as models for others to examine. The model of the LDP as an individual fellowship grant to potential leaders, especially

for inexperienced individuals, is now seen as one that would not be adopted by private or governmental sources because of its high cost in relation to short-range, direct benefits. With the modifications to the basic LDP model which have been made by those now administering programs on grantee status, it was felt that other sources of support might be found to continue the programs. (See the following description of the Native American Leadership Development Program for an example of a program that originated from LDP. It contains modifications based upon some of the information cited above which may make its continuation more feasible and its impact even greater than the parent program.)

To summarize briefly, the unique aspects of the Ford Leadership Development Program appeared to this researcher to be: (1) the emphasis on training potential leaders from among minority groups in rural communities, (2) the development of personally tailored individual programs combining a variety of field-based, non-academic experiences, and (3) the recent emphasis on more closely tying the individual experience to the participant's community and its needs.

As a final note on LDP, the investigator found the unpublished evaluations of this project to be very interesting and worthwhile although incomplete; it is hoped that the Ford Foundation's planned publication of the story of the Leadership Development Program will include descriptive as well as evaluative information. The program is one which can serve as a model and lesson to others eager to further the growth of potential leaders, particularly among minority peoples in rural communities.

Cultural Aspects of Educational Leadership Program

Cultural Aspects of Educational Leadership (CAEL), a program of the East-West Center, differed from Ford's LDP program in several ways, including types of participants, program goals, and methods of training. Written information on this project was very limited and most of the information used here was derived from discussions with an administrator who had been with the program since its inception, plus various brochures, bulletins, and publications published by the East-West Center. Formal evaluation materials and any publications describing the program and its evolution in depth were not available.

The Center was founded by the United States Congress in 1960 and continues under Federal funding with a mandated goal: "... to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific through cooperative study, training and research."¹⁵ Formerly, the Center was administered in cooperation with the University of Hawaii; in 1975 the Hawaii State Legislature created a public non-profit corporation with a board of governors to direct the Center. The Center was built upon land adjacent to and provided by the University. Participants in Center programs can arrange to affiliate with University degree programs.

Cultural Aspects of Educational Leadership, at the time it was studied, was administered by the East-West Culture Learning Institute, one of five institutes at the Center. The Institute's programs were said to have the following common aim: "... to develop more effective methods of helping persons from different cultures and sub-cultures to understand other persons' cultures and sub-cultures as well as their own."¹⁶

A cross-cultural perspective was a key to understanding this and other programs sponsored by the Culture Learning Institute. This perspective was well expressed by Brislin, an institute faculty member:

One of the best ways to gain insight into our own behavior is to observe the antecedents and consequences of similar behavior in other cultures. Observing behavior in other cultures allows people to see the reasons behind their own

¹⁵East-West Culture Learning Institute, "Announcement: The Cultural Aspects of Educational Leadership Program, 1977," Honolulu: East-West Center, p. 5.

¹⁶East-West Culture Learning Institute, "Bulletin 1974-75," Honolulu: East-West Center, p. 1.

*behavior more clearly since the blinders imposed by the culture to which they belong are removed for a short time.*¹⁷

Cultural Aspects of Educational Leadership had its origins in 1967. It was designed in response to a need in the Pacific Islands for training administrators and teacher trainers for their school systems. Early programs lasted six months and consisted of two days a week of seminars provided by the Center and two days a week of internship experience provided through the College of Education. The final day of the week was allocated for individual research and study. According to one instructor, the aim of the program in its early days, when it was called "Education Administration: Elementary and Secondary," was to give the participants a sense of confidence in their own leadership ability rather than trying to convert them to another style.

One problem identified early in the program was that people from the Pacific Islands were taught things relating to the American education system which they found impossible to adapt when they went back home. The administrator interviewed commented that in order to be able to adapt something, you have to be able to adapt it before you go there; in other words, to try it out before you take it back home. However, he also noted that in these early programs, participants benefited most through increased self-confidence, and returned home with a new self-respect and a better feeling for themselves and their abilities to handle school problems.

In 1970, the East-West Center was reorganized and educational programs were placed under the Culture Learning Institute. This move lessened the program's dependence on the University and changed its emphasis. Rather than focusing solely on educational administration, the major emphasis was on culture.

In discussing this increased emphasis on culture, an Institute staff person, instrumental in designing the program, said in an interview:

I am now beginning to realize it is not the understanding that causes the problems, it is the misunderstanding. We have changed the focus and it is sort of building a certain tolerance for cross-cultural misunderstandings. This is mainly our objective. What we do is bring the professionals here to meet together, share ideas and learn from each other—share problems, share solutions, share cultural background, etc.—and by doing this, enriching their own professional background through meeting with others. They are also helping us meet our [the Center's] goal, which is better understanding between East and West. By providing them with an opportunity of going out in the field and with formal seminars, they are also receiving something professionally It is an opportunity for them to look back at their own situation home more objectively, assess it, analyze it, share it with colleagues from other countries, and as a result, they are enriched culturally as well as professionally.

Applications to the CAEL program did not come from individuals but as nominations from institutions or appropriate government agencies. The agency generally contributed part of the cost, although some fully-funded awards were available. The applicants must also have been active professionals in some aspect of education, though no longer necessarily teachers, and they must have been able to communicate and write well in English. Participants were expected to prove that they were returning to their jobs, since part of the purpose of the program was to create a multiplier effect in that the participants would pass their knowledge on to others.

A formal selection committee of Institute staff chose the participants with one criteria being an equitable country spread. Each workshop included about 15 participants and the Center generally received four to five times that many applications. In some countries, previous participants served as interviewers.

¹⁷Brislin, R.W., "Social Psychology in Cross-Cultural Perspective: Some Trends," *Culture and Language Learning Newsletter*, Honolulu: East-West Cultural Learning Institute, July, 1975, p. 9.

Program participants tended to be mid-career, of the middle-age group, and established in their profession. Originally, degrees were not required nor held by most of the participants. Recently, there has been an increase in the number of participants with basic and more advanced degrees.

The program participants were a heterogenous group; the Institute did not attempt to choose people who were necessarily academically equivalent. The participants varied a great deal in age as well as education. Often those who were older and recognized as leaders in their own community did not have as much formal education as some younger ones, but this wisdom was respected and experiences shared. The group worked together as a team as much as possible, and this concept was fostered by both the formal sessions as well as living conditions similar to dormitory life. The program was not competitive, and the administrators of the program saw this as an asset in building group spirit. Also, it was felt that group decision-making and group responsibility was compatible with the Pacific and Asian cultures from which participants were drawn.

The program continued to be administered on a "2-2-1" basis with two days of theory or seminars, two days of field experience, and one day for self-study. The revised program lasted four months and the courses were specifically designed by Institute staff for this leadership program.

The program was not designed for credit. However, there was an arrangement worked out through the College of Continuing Education of the University, where for a fee, participants could receive credit if they chose to. Those who opted for credit had extra work to do. About half appeared to want credit, often giving the reason that it was helpful back home to their professional status. This credit was often applied toward degrees taken at home institutions.

One change in the program was that it had been shortened from six to four months. It was the consensus that any program of less than four months was insufficient, but that more than four months made it difficult for participants to be away from their jobs and families. Also, from a cost-analysis point of view, the Institute found it inefficient to run a project for less than four months, given factors such as high travel and administrative costs.

Another major change has occurred in the field experience aspect of the program, shifting from use of an internship concept to what was called a counterpart relationship. The counterpart person was a volunteer whose job was matched closely to the job the participant had at home. Rather than being placed as interns observing theory in actual practice, participants were considered more as colleagues with experiences to share with their counterparts. They were not just observers, but active professionals who took on responsibility appropriate to their backgrounds and interests. The relationship was more collegial than teacher/learner. As described by an administrator of the program, the counterpart concept:

... mostly is a sharing of ideas rather than 'you watch me do it and hopefully you can learn from me' type of thing—that is an intern. A colleague is two people in the same soup together but who come from two different cultures. They might be of help to each other, or might be a pain-in-the-neck.

Participants filled out monthly reports on their experiences and a final report. These were analyzed internally for planning purposes. Group leaders had found that many participants were hesitant to cite anything negative about the program; therefore, they deferred asking for suggestions until the final report.

In reviewing monthly reports of past students, the following generalized comments were noted as being among the most frequent: six months was considered too long a period; the importance of informal contacts, home visits, etc., was often stressed; guest speakers were well received; some seemed to have trouble grasping theory as it was presented; and several noted the importance to them of the counterpart role and of having the experience of actually "doing."

The administrator interviewed felt that most participants went back to their original jobs and many were promoted. There was no official follow-up carried out, although travelling staff frequently visited former participants. There are also alumni associations in many regions.

In response to being asked what had been learned from the experience of running the program, the program administrator cited two points: (1) you cannot expect people to adapt their experience to their culture after the program is over—they have to adapt it on-the-spot and be

helped to make that adaption, and (2) our cultural background pushes us to be the doers and puts the participants in the recipient mode. On this latter point, he said that the project tried to break down this pattern by having participants become involved in running the program, but it was difficult to encourage participants to act as colleagues. Although people leading the program attempted to be flexible, program participants themselves did not always appreciate the flexibility and preferred to follow more formal outlines.

One additional problem noted was that support staff (e.g., secretarial and dormitory staff) were not always sensitive to cross-cultural matters. In-service training had been suggested to alleviate this but it was not being done.

The purpose of the Cultural Aspects of Educational Leadership program for the current year (February/May 1977) was stated as follows:

*This program is designed to provide opportunities for leading scholars and educational planners from Asia, the Pacific, the United States to come together to examine existing educational policies and programs in response to the impact of increasing intercultural contacts. The participants will interact with each other in sharing experiences, ideas, data, methods, and research results for the specific purpose of providing workable solutions to existing problems*¹⁸

In a letter from the director of the Institute, it was noted that this program was shifting its emphasis from focus on bilingual, bicultural education to the theme of "promoting better relations and understanding between East and West through innovative educational programs." It was difficult to interpret what is proposed change in the program might mean.

In an informal discussion with one Institute staff member, it recently was learned that there are no plans to continue this program beyond this year. (See Appendix B for the most up-to-date information.) The only reason suggested was that most staff felt it was an applied program and did not meet their research interests. Though the program was perceived as successful by most, there was no formal evaluation data available to support these perceptions; one can only speculate how the availability of positive evaluative data might have influenced the decision to discontinue the program.

Key ingredients of the Cultural Aspects of Educational Leadership program appeared to be: (1) the utilization of cross-cultural education concepts, (2) the group learning process, and (3) the counterpart role in the field-based component.

Given the variety of cross-cultural research activities at the Cultural Learning Institute, it was disappointing not to see more interest from staff and students in examining these and other aspects of this training activity as an instance of applied research, subject to thoughtful analysis and evaluation. Interaction among trainers and researchers and the integration of their respective findings should be a mutually beneficial process, and lead to better training as well as more unified support to such programs.

Education Policy Fellowship Program

The Educational Policy Fellowship Program (EPF), formerly called Washington Internships in Education, began in 1965 and became a part of the Institute for Educational Leadership of George Washington University upon the establishment of the Institute in 1971. The program was supported by Ford and Rockefeller Foundations and indirectly by agencies which sponsor the internship component of the program by paying the salary of each fellow. The project differed from the two previously described in that a single full year internship assignment was the primary activity in combination with concurrent group experiences. Fellows participated as a group in an educational program, usually convening once a week, which included meetings with educational leaders, seminars and site visits to study policy implementation. Most of the fellows were in their early 30's,

¹⁸East-West Culture Learning Institute, "Announcement: The Cultural Aspects of Educational Leadership Program, 1977," Honolulu: East-West Center, p. 1.

had already attained a measure of success as college instructors, researchers and other professionals. Approximately one-third held doctorate degrees. In recent years, more than one-half of the fellows were minorities or women.

Until 1971, fellows were placed only in Washington, D.C. agencies. Since then, fellows have been located in Boston, Massachusetts; Springfield, Illinois; and Lansing, Michigan. New sites in Ohio and Minnesota were added in 1976. Each fellow entered a full year of responsible professional work in a policymaking agency at Federal or state levels, or in education associations, advocacy groups and other education policy-related organizations.

Director Dr. Paul T. Schindler explained the program's change in name:

The 'W' [Washington, D.C.] and the 'I' [Internship] just aren't appropriate or accurate any longer. These capable, high-powered men and women aren't 'interns' really, because that implies college students. And for three years now, WIE hasn't been restricted to Washington. The new name will describe the substantive focus on the program—women and men learning about and participating in the making of public policy in education.¹⁹

The Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL), the sponsoring organization, is small, non-federal and non-profit, based in Washington, D.C., and funded by the Ford Foundation. The Institute was organized because of a concern for the lack of understanding and communication between government officials and those in the education hierarchy. The Institute's approach was to assemble these two groups on neutral ground for a realistic exchange of ideas, thus serving a facilitative role and not taking sides on issues from a political standpoint.

The Educational Policy Fellowship Program is one of several programs run under the Institute. Moorefield, in an article describing the Institute, noted all IEL programs had a common goal of:

Encouraging legislators and educators to broaden their dialog, look at issues from more than one perspective, and, in the process, improve education's decision-making and administration.²⁰

The Institute arranges for all of its programs' participants to meet with Congressional and other top Federal officials. The fellows, in being attached to the Institute, also had the advantage of meeting with participants of the other IEL programs.

The Education Policy Fellowship Program encouraged applications from U.S. citizens between 25 and 35 years of age who were college graduates, had significant professional experience in some aspect of human services, had given evidence of leadership, showed interest in improving education, and were prepared to devote full time to fellowship commitments. Usually, approximately 30 persons were selected from more than 300 applicants.

In this program, the sponsors or agency where the fellows were placed paid 100 percent of the salary. Although the program selected people to the semifinalist level, sponsors made the final decisions. A staff person mentioned that in the future, the semifinalists would be asked to list specific skills in addition to the application form now used (the two-page application requires three essays, five recommendations and school transcripts). Fellows were placed with sponsors on the basis of their interests and background.

During discussions with the administrators of the Education Policy Fellowship Program, this researcher was told there was only one evaluation report, done by Sorenson on the 1968-69 interns.²¹ Sorenson pointed out that individual interns were affected in different ways by the program, and felt it important to stress as a key strength of the program: "... that group members could change in different ways without those responsible for the program being displeased."²² He

¹⁹"Monthly Memo," Washington, D.C.: Institute For Educational Leadership, Number 13, Summer 1975, p. 1.

²⁰Moorefield, S., "The Education Connection," *American Education*, October, 1975, p. 11.

²¹Sorenson, D., *Group Report: WIE Interns, 1968-1969*, Provo: Brigham Young University, (no date).

²²Sorenson, p. 1.

noted that interns had spoken of this factor as the most important characteristic of the program, in that each could decide how the year might be of most benefit to himself/herself and did not have to be concerned primarily with what would be beneficial for the group or its sponsors.

This evaluation seemed unusual in that it relied heavily on psychological testing. The tests used included Harvard Alphas, Rorschach test, Hand test, and the Visual Impressions Test. The report noted that before the evaluation began, the group as a whole had expressed antagonism toward testing procedures. The results of these tests did not appear to be very meaningful to the overall evaluation of the program.

Besides the tests, interns also were interviewed at the beginning and end of the year. From this data, changes in the interns were analyzed. It was reported that the interns felt they had changed most in respect to feelings toward themselves, which could generally be summed up as increased self-confidence. A high percentage of interns valued the opportunity the program gave them to try out different roles. A small number of the interns felt the year had changed their career goals by exposing them to roles with which they were previously unfamiliar, while many saw the internship as providing them with time to think and plan career goals. Approximately 30 percent of the interns noted the importance of contacts made during the year; and a knowledge of the legislative and political processes ranked high on the list of benefits listed.

The few negative comments which were reported included that a small number of interns had been intimidated by the responsibilities they observed being held by others, resulting in their talking of withdrawing to more secure roles in an "academic environment." However, the researcher noted that for the majority:

The year gave them greater confidence in their ability to bring off well the projects they attempt and more of an idea where their efforts might be most productive. Their horizons have been broadened, i.e., they see how their talents might be used on a wider scale.²³

At the conclusion of the fellowship, according to an IEL brochure, fellows were required to submit a detailed report summarizing and analyzing their experiences in "personal, professional, and policy terms," but no analysis of such reports was mentioned in discussing evaluation with administrators of the program. When the current director was asked about the lack of evaluative information, he replied that in times of limited budget, evaluations were generally better left out than done in haphazard, and not necessarily reliable, ways.

The assistant director, in discussing changes over time in this program, indicated that the program was shifting directions in a number of ways. It had been a postgraduate program, requiring a master's degree, but that provision was deleted, allowing the program to be more directed toward mid-career level persons. It had broadened its interest to an audience in the "human sciences" rather than strictly education. The fellows of this past year (1975-76) were described by her as having more of a mixed background than in other years, including the fact that there were more women than men in the program. The program attempted to broaden its outlook and change recruiting procedures, as the administrators found that the channels they had been using were not reaching out to the audiences they were now trying to attract. For instance, they now were emphasizing recruitment of southern blacks.

In response to a question on Alaskan participation in the program, she replied that to the best of her knowledge, there had been no Alaskan participants. The Institute, she said, would welcome the opportunity to review applications from Alaska and regretted that their recruitment procedures and limited funds did not allow as thorough coverage of distant parts of the country as they would like.

The most important feature of this program might be its ability to supplement a meaningful internship experience with a concurrent group educational experience. Without evaluative information, the effectiveness of the program was difficult to judge. However, it continued to be a popular program. According to the information available, participants seemed to value foremost the

²³Sorenson, p. 16.

experience and contacts the program gave them, and many remained in the Washington, D.C., area, in the policy arena, rather than returning to their previous positions.

White House Fellowships

The White House Fellowships (WHF) program, founded in 1964, could be viewed as the elite of all leadership/intern programs. In 1965, a statement of purpose was adopted by the President's Commission on White House Fellowships:

In this country today, we produce great numbers of skilled professionals; but too few of this intellectual elite provide the society with statesmanlike leadership and guidance in public affairs . . . Surely the raw material is still there; and just as surely, more must be done in the development of our ablest young people to inspire and facilitate the emergence of such leaders and statesmen. Their horizons and experience must be broadened to give them a sense of personal involvement in the leadership of the society, a vision of greatness for the society, and a sense of responsibility for bringing that greatness to reality.²⁴

Though the basic structure of the program was similar to some others studied, especially the Washington, D.C., based Education Policy Fellowship Program described previously, the WHF program differed mostly in matters of degree: the complexity of the application and selection procedures; the competitiveness of the program in terms of the ratio of applications to acceptances; the high level of the assignment at which fellows were placed; and the possibilities within the education program, supported by large budget, for fellows to guide the choice of speakers and travel. These were some of the differences, which, when coupled with the general prestige of operating within the Executive Branch, appeared to have created an elitist aura about this program.

The President's Commission on White House Fellowships was organized to operate the program and was supported by a Civil Service budget line item. The program was designed around work assignments, with salary paid by the agency to which a fellow was assigned, plus an education program sponsored by private contributions. Assignments were at the highest level, such as special assistants to the Vice President, a member of Cabinet, head of an independent Executive Branch agency, principal member of the President's staff, or similar such powerful persons. Unlike many other programs, fellows were not necessarily assigned to an area in which they had previously worked. For example, an educator recently was assigned to the Defense Department.

The White House Fellowships Program was open to men and women of all occupations except for employees of the Executive Branch of the Federal government, although career military were eligible. Applicants were required to be citizens and between 23 and 36 years of age. According to the application for the 1976-77 year, the program sought persons who:

(1) have demonstrated unusual ability, high moral character, outstanding motivation, and a broad capacity for leadership; (2) show exceptional promise of future development; and (3) are dedicated to the institutions of the United States.

Applications were due in November before the year of the program. The application form was the longest of any reviewed and asked for a wide variety of information including applicant's education and how it was financed, employment history, contributions to community and profession, leisure time activities, travel, languages spoken and results of various testing. Several short essays as well as references were required. In addition, the applicant also was instructed to ask two people to fill out personal evaluation forms in which the applicant would be rated on such things as leadership, intellectual ability, decisiveness, and integrity.

Initial screening was done by staff on the basis of the application and personal evaluations.

²⁴The White House Fellowships, July 1975, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975 (0-587-578), p. v.

Regional selection panels then reviewed the files and selected those to be personally interviewed. The panels designated selected regional finalists. From these nominations, the Commission selected approximately 30 national finalists. National finalists were invited, at the Commission's expense, to a rural retreat in the Washington, D.C., area where final selections were made by the Commission. Congress had set the maximum number of participants at 19; for the 1975-76 Fellowship year, 2,300 applications were received and 14 fellows were selected.

After the selection announcement, the new fellows were interviewed by agencies within the Executive Branch to determine their assignments. The nature of the fellowship duties varies greatly. In some cases, a fellow will concentrate on one or two policy issues where others will have a much broader and more varied assignment. According to the brochures: "throughout the year, emphasis is placed on linking theory and practice, analysis and action."

The work assignments were supplemented by an educational program which consisted of seminar meetings and travel in which fellows participated as a group. According to the staff person with whom the investigator talked, the fellows themselves suggested topics, people with whom they would like to meet, and also had an influence on planning selected travel for educational purposes. A year ago, the fellows' interest in the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Project prompted a trip to Alaska. They frequently met with Cabinet Secretaries, senior White House staff members, Congressmen, Supreme Court justices, ambassadors, media figures, labor leaders, and others.

A list of past fellows in the 1975 publication included one Alaskan, John Havelock (1967-68).

Former and current fellows were members of a White House Fellows Association. According to the information brochure, the Association collected a permanent fund to guarantee the continued quality of the program and its independent and nonpartisan nature.

Like any other leadership program, it was far more difficult to identify the results of the program than to describe it. After having met with the Commission staff, the only evaluation which appeared to be available was a set of questions that were put together by a former fellow in 1975 but never analyzed nor put into any published form. Ninety-three of 153 former fellows responded to several general statements they were asked to rate. Those statements which were rated highest were: "Considering your fellowship year as a whole, rate its contribution to your overall education" and "How favorably did your fellowship experience affect you?" Out of a possible five points, those two statements were rated 4.6 and 4.8 respectively as an average from all respondents. Those statements which received the lowest rating, though still above the mean, were "... the distinguishing mark of a White House Fellow is an involvement in public affairs" (3.7) and "How favorably did your fellowship experience affect your community involvement?" (3.8). Other statements received ratings between these two extremes.

In a critical article cited previously on the White House Fellows by Rand, called "Collecting Merit Badges: The White House Fellows," he said of the program:

*As much as any class of winners, the White House Fellows illustrate the contrast between 'making it' with a new credential and 'doing it' with some clear goal in mind.*²⁵

Rand apparently interviewed a number of past and present fellows and found that everyone involved in the program felt that it was very successful. One alumni noticed the program was often seen as a way to break from the past and move into new fields; the article stated that nearly half of the fellows stayed in Washington. Rand also noted that during the application procedures, especially the conference of finalists near Washington, few finalists felt they had a chance of being chosen once they had looked over the list of accomplishments of their competitors. Rand criticized the program and the fellows themselves as not being or training leaders but as catering to systematic achievers:

*... the refined and highly trained later version of the cooperative first-grader who gets the gold star for doing what the teacher wants.*²⁶

²⁵Rand, p. 48.

²⁶Rand, p. 56.

Rand's material also showed the White House Fellows have an inclination to move from one job to another after their year in the program.

The White House Fellows Program was the only one studied whose continuance did not seem in question. Perhaps it was the elite nature of the Program that allowed it to continue for twelve years in its amply supported manner with no evaluation.

National Urban Fellows Program

The National Urban Fellows Program was another leadership-type training program funded initially by the Ford Foundation. It was developed to meet the pressing need for minority group urban administrators and was initially administered from New Haven, through a 1969 grant to the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors. The principal investigator spoke with the Foundation monitor for the project and was given access to a 1972 evaluation report on the program which was intended for internal use only.

Although this program may seem quite unrelated to the Alaskan scene, it was interesting to note from material provided that at least three Alaskan Natives participated in the early years of the program.

The program provided an extensive, high-level internship under an experienced mentor, which allowed the fellows to participate in policy-making and be observers in the environment in which the policy was made. In addition to the on-the-job experience, the program had two academic components: a summer program with orientation and classroom instruction located at Yale University preceding the internship, and a more recently added optional master's degree program through Occidental College following the internship. This degree option was developed by and at the request of some fellows in the first year of the program. There was no educational program during the internship period, as was the pattern in some previously described programs.

The target audience for this program was mid-level persons who had already demonstrated some ability in administration in communities or similar programs. The program operated by encouraging a group of mentors to pay half the salary of the fellows, who then were to receive serious consideration for continued employment. Those who did not remain with their mentors usually stayed in the area of public management and administration.

Applicants to the program usually held at least one degree. They were requested to fill out application forms and supply references and autobiographical career goal essays. After an initial screening of applications, applicants were interviewed by regional teams.

Those accepted to the program went through an orientation program held at Yale University but run by the project. In the early years at least, the orientation was of questionable value with complaints on both sides—from the teachers, in terms of the students' lack of interest, attentiveness or attendance; and from the students, in terms of the irrelevance and overly academic tone of the information provided.

For this observer, the most unique aspect of this program was the intensity of the feeling expressed by the initial participants about the importance of credentialing, a feeling shared neither by those who originally designed the project nor the project mentors. At the insistence of the fellows, and through the work of one in particular, an optional master's degree program was arranged which included credit for the fellowship experience. However, all three components of the project—orientation, internship, and optional degree—were only loosely tied together, and lack of coordination and continuity among them was often mentioned as a problem area in the evaluation.

The unpublished 1972 evaluation report also described several kinds of inter-personal problems between administrators and participants in the program, which appeared to culminate after the third year of the program. The fellows wanted a larger role in shaping the program, which led to almost unanimous support for the idea of a board of directors. There was no information available on how well the board of directors functioned. The evaluator made the observation that since self-determination was the issue among minority groups, that a program designed for them must come to grips with this reality.

The evaluation report also discussed the process of pairing mentors and fellows. It pointed out the difficulty of supplying to both persons adequate information upon which to make suitable

choices and the difficulty of making assignments since not all mentors nor participants could receive their first choice. Often fellows chose the best-known or most-colorful personality which did not always turn out to be the best intern situation for that particular fellow. As the program progressed, more extensive information or background files were developed on mentors and the list of options expanded. A ranking system for assigning choices also was instituted, although the director still exercised the ultimate control over assignments.

The relationship between mentor and fellow was noted as the most difficult part of the internship experience. Suggestions to improve this problem included an opportunity to meet mentors before matchings were finalized and more staff monitoring of the internships. It also was considered very important that the mentor had a good understanding of the program and the role he/she was meant to play, as being a mentor was a demanding task for a busy person to undertake.

Another aspect of the program noted in the evaluation was that of placement of the fellows in permanent employment, since this program specifically did not expect fellows to return to their previous jobs. How great a role the program should have had in job placement for program graduates appeared to be a point of controversy. The fact that the literature on the program was ambiguous on this point led to varied expectations on the part of the fellows in terms of their future employment. For instance, some fellows expected very large salary increases after completing the program. It appeared that many did receive employment in a wide range of policy-making positions—several continuing employment with their mentors and others remaining in the cities in which they had been placed. Also, most did receive a salary increase.

When the program attempted to locate alternative sources of financial support by requesting the mentors to pay half the salary, at first the reaction was mixed, but the program continued to operate in this way. The program most recently was operated directly by the National Urban Fellows, Inc. Ford funding for a six-year program grant was to terminate in 1975, but the program has continued.

The reader is cautioned to keep in mind that some of the above information was derived from the 1972 evaluation report and may be severely dated. In a conversation with the Foundation monitor, he indicated that the mentors have, over time, been convinced of the validity of the process. He noted fellows have been placed in rather good positions, many of them continuing in the fellowship locations. In response to a question about the importance of differing education levels of various fellows in the program, the monitor said that the discrepancies in education were not considered a problem; that in this program the job experience placement (or internship) was used as a way of accounting for the variability of the educational levels of the trainees. He also noted that in the first year of the program it had been important to seek out participants who would be perceived as a "plus" for the program and, therefore, the emphasis on choosing mid-career minorities or those who had already established some degree of success.

In summary, the most interesting aspects of the National Urban Fellows Program seemed to be successful lobbying by participants for an optional degree program and, some say, in running the program through the board of directors. The unpublished evaluation also detailed three interesting problem areas for those considering planning a leadership/intern program: (1) the difficulty of administering a multi-faceted program (education, work experience, and degree components) with no overall coordination, (2) the difficulty of matching mentors and fellows so as to grant each his/her choice, while at the same time trying to arrange for an effective experience, and (3) the importance of the mentor/fellow relationship and the need to clearly explain and monitor this aspect of a program. It is hoped that as the program continues, evaluative studies will be conducted that will describe how the program has met these problems.

City-University Educational Leadership Programs

Six city-university programs were funded under the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) as educational leadership programs. Information on these programs was gathered from literature obtained at the Institute for Educational Leadership. These programs were all designed to promote cooperative relationships in the training of educational administrators among schools, their communities and universities; and all programs involved internships and practicums in administration of city school systems. The programs were of particular interest to this researcher

because they were evaluated in an analytical case-study framework by Schindler (1973), as previously noted, and in a briefer survey style by Resource Management Corporation.²⁷

According to the RMC report, almost all participants had at least a bachelor's degree and most expected a more advanced degree as a result of this experience. All programs attempted to recruit minority participants from the cooperating school systems; approximately 70 percent of the participants were minorities.

The RMC report also noted that over one-third of the participants identified interaction among participants and effectiveness of the staff as the two strongest features of the program, while one-third felt that the practical experience in the field was one of the weakest features. Almost 50 percent of the participants suggested that an increase of participant input into the process and more clearly defined goals and objectives would improve the city-university programs.

Schindler's report raised many interesting issues relevant to designing leadership programs, particularly those including an internship. In discussing recruitment and selection, Schindler argued that: "... recruitment/selection models should be rethought so they can stimulate growth and learning as well as assessment."²⁸ He felt the selection experience should help improve the applicant, and whether the applicant would be chosen for the program or not, that the experience should be beneficial. He added that it was essential that all applicants understand a program's purpose and further suggested that those who meet the general requirements be invited to participate in a two or three-day seminar or a mini-program. For those who were not chosen, an exit interview, including the reasons for rejection, should take place. This interview also might include suggestions of other appropriate programs to which these individuals could apply. One reason for this expanded view of the selection process was that Schindler found that those persons who had not been accepted to the program often felt hostile toward the program and became its first detractors.

In reviewing the internship experiences, the Schindler report noted that one of the overriding themes that correlated with the interns' definition of a good experience was having some responsible job to perform. The most common misuse of interns involved having them do leg-work while presumably some else did the all-important head-work. Some interns, it was reported, managed to avoid such pitfalls by preparing a personal needs assessment and working out a contract with the host administrator. The report continued: "In some cases, both sides negotiated their needs, and both were winners."²⁹

The intern coordinator or person facilitating the internship experience was said to be the critical person in making this program work. It was suggested that this person must have credibility in all groups being dealt with and that it should be a high-status role.

In discussing the appropriate length of an internship, most program participants judged the length of their own experience to be just about perfect, whether their internship lasted ten weeks or three years; therefore, no specific guidelines were evident. However, it did seem evident that interns themselves must be self-starters and able to take initiative for the internship experience to be successful.

The report also noted the importance of dealing with the status of the intern's work placement. Such things as being assigned a desk and receiving communication promptly seemed important indicators of being accorded status. In one program, the school board members, rather than a university selection committee, chose the interns, and an unexpected result was that these interns clearly possessed political clout and found doors opened to them that were closed to others.

Schindler felt that a common weakness of most programs seems to be a lack of basic control mechanisms, which, if not established at the outset, could only be established later with great difficulty. In order to test whether such mechanisms exist in any program, the author suggested the following test question: "Can you give me a brief vignette describing a hypothetical participant you

²⁷ Crosby, R., Mass, L. and Price, R., "Survey and Analysis of Educational Leadership Projects Supported by the Education Profession Development Act," Report UR-292, Volume III: A Descriptive Report of the City/University Projects, Bethesda: Research Management Corporation, July, 1975.

²⁸ Schindler, p. 24.

²⁹ Schindler, p. 40.

would decide to terminate from the program, and the steps you would take to do it?"³⁰

The overall goal of the programs seemed uncertain and programs of post-program placement highlighted this. In some locations, interns gained administrative experience which prepared them for jobs not available if they remained in the school district sponsoring the program. In other programs, the participants did not feel that the administrative training was in any way in conflict with returning to their teaching assignments. Sometimes the administrative experience clearly had an opposite from the intended effect, in that former interns no longer had any interest in participating in administration. Another more theoretical problem was that in attempting to train potential administrators to be innovative, they might be co-opted through an internship experience into the same thinking that presently existed in their school systems.

Schindler found that group spirit was more characteristic of the pioneer groups in the program than of subsequent ones. He noted that innovations can grow old very quickly and groups in the second or third year of the program seemed to take as givens what the first group thought of as daring innovations. He suggested that:

*Each cadre wants to see itself as different, special, with its own trademark. This uniqueness is jeopardized if they are programmed in the image of their predecessors . . . there may be need for some change for the sake of change, to admit explicitly that 'this group is different.'*³¹

Schindler considered the problem of the degree to which interns in a leadership training program should have input to decision-making in the program:

*What may be operative here is less actual argument with the state of affairs . . . but rather a desire to live up to expectations. By definition, the persons brought into the program were leaders, take-charge sort of persons . . . The obvious hazard, when the cadre takes an activist stance during the short period of student status, is that the members will lose the time that they need to achieve credibility and legitimacy as administrators.*³²

The report also suggested that the "we feeling" generated by the programs between school system and university staff should be continued after the program's termination in some systematic way and possibly given a national perspective through a national conference or national organizations.

For the purposes of this report, the most interesting aspect of the City-University Educational Leadership Program was that it was the only leadership program found which published evaluation reports, probably due to the requirements of its Federal EPDA funding. Though the leadership programs were not continued, the evaluation provided descriptive information as well as recommendations, as highlighted above, which could be very useful to persons planning any type of leadership/intern experience.

American Indian Education Leadership Development Program

The American Indian Education Leadership Development (AIELD) Program was managed by the National Indian Training and Research Center (NITRC) of Tempe, Arizona. Beginning in 1976, this project was funded by Ford Foundation for three years. It could be considered an "offspring" of the Ford Leadership Development Program, and probably the recipient of the last such grant to be issued.

According to Ford internal documents proposing the new program, Indians in the original

³⁰Schindler, p. 50.

³¹Schindler, p. 34.

³²Schindler, p. 109.

Leadership Development Program were represented, without special quotas, at approximately 10 percent of the total participants. Also according to this report, Indian fellows had been some of the most successful and least successful candidates. The Ford report indicated that in earlier LDP programs, the structure of local education for Indians had made it difficult for potential Indian leaders to go back to their home communities and assume responsible positions.

However, in the last several years, Federal and state attitudes have changed and there are increased Federal funds available for Indian programs, many run by the Indian communities themselves. Indian self-determination and local control was a growing, recent movement, which the proposal for this program recognized. The Foundation also felt that if the program were managed by an Indian organization, there would be greater political acceptance in the Indian community and a better chance of program relevance for the fellows. Not only was the scene set nationally for Indians to take over local educational programs, but as a direct consequence, local leaders were in great demand.

The organization chosen to manage this program, NITRC, was founded in 1968 to:

... involve American Indians in leadership and professional roles through training and research for the social and economic betterment of Indian people, to educate professionals working with Indians about culture and life-styles, to encourage Indians themselves to become more involved in their own affairs, to develop more relevant educational experiences through prototype programs for the American Indian, and to add to the existing body of knowledge about the American Indian, specifically in the field of education.

(NITRC Articles of Incorporation)

A NITRC brochure listed services available in program development, curriculum design, evaluation, organizational development, training for administrators, teachers and board of education committees, and technical assistance and consulting in management and administration. The organization has provided services to school districts, special projects, tribes, Bureau of Indian Affairs, colleges and communities. The organization met Ford's criteria for an effectively operated Indian organization which was non-profit, multi-tribal, politically neutral, and had the respect of non-Indians as well. The organization was run by a board of directors which included Emma Widmark, Tlinget, of Juneau, Alaska.

Similar to other LDP programs, this effort stressed local leadership needs, broadly in the area of education for rural communities. According to the "Fact Sheet" issued by NITRC:

*The AIELD is aimed at developing and enhancing the leadership abilities and skills of persons who are working in rural Indian communities and presently filling some leadership role in education and other education-related activities as a paid or unpaid employee or volunteer.*³³

Criteria for eligibility included adults who: had some leadership experience and demonstrated potential, expected to return to their home communities and make further contributions toward the improvement of Indian education, did not hold a recognized position of authority, resided in rural Indian areas, and were not pursuing a college degree. (It was indicated that the training would not provide college credit.) It was intended that participants should be those who had a keen desire to upgrade their skills and for various reasons had previously lacked the opportunity for training. The program recognized that there were currently a number of non-Indians who also provided local leadership and these persons were not excluded from applying.

The application form was far more specific than the earlier LDP request for a narrative autobiography. The applicant was asked to list training, interests, community activities, and a short statement concerning desire to participate in the program. The applicant also was asked to include

³³"Fact Sheet," American Indian Education Leadership Development Program, Tempe: National Indian Training and Research Center, p. 1 (undated).

ideas concerning the educational needs of his/her community and how involvement in this program would begin to resolve those needs. The obvious emphasis was on the relation between the participants and the community, rather than strictly on personal development, and this emphasis was seen in other aspects of the project also.

Applications were screened and applicants interviewed where possible by the NITRC staff. A selection committee consisting of two members of the NITRC board and two Indian educators made the final selection, according to the fact sheet. (In the case of the two current Alaskan participants in the first year of the program, there were no interviews.)

The educational program of AIELD followed the basic LDP format in that the participant designed his/her own program and selected training experiences that would best fit his/her individual needs. However, the program also differed in many ways from the original LDP concept in its emphasis on the relationship of the program to community needs. This program also appeared to be more specific and definitive in its objectives, even in its first year. The program developers issued a handbook on the program (April 1976) which included the intent and purposes, goals, objectives, and operating procedures of the program. (The lack of such specifics was cited among the weaknesses of the early LDP implementation where objectives seemed unclear and procedures rather loose according to the evaluator.)

The NITRC project also provided more group activities and greater guidance for the participants in designing and carrying out their own personal education plan. For instance, rather than each trainee beginning independently as in the LDP model, all were brought together for an orientation session at which they chose a mentor or individual from the Indian community to help them design a plan. During the approximately five days of orientation, each fellow, with help from the staff, developed a statement of purpose and a description of desired program results, and then began to design the rest of the training plan. The training plan covered a period of up to seven months and included activities such as apprenticeships, travel, visit to model projects, work experience, and independent studies—similar to the range of previous LDP activities.

There also was an added emphasis on frequent contact with the home community. Applicants were required to provide two references from their communities. As stated in the application: "These people should be aware of your potential and provide a description of your strengths as a person." Further, the first year's participants returned to their home communities after the orientation to seek feedback on their learning objectives and to research resources applicable to each objective, according to correspondence with the project coordinator.

The mentor was a new concept which has been added to the previous LDP format. The mentors, as well as the staff and participants, attended the orientation session and worked on the development of the educational plans. The mentors were, according to the fact sheet, reputable and experienced Indian educators or educational leaders who were to act as advisors to the participants in designing their programs. A list of potential mentors was available to participants or they could suggest someone not on the list. How the mentor concept would work in actuality was not yet known; the question of how mentors could keep in contact with their participants during the year was important to the success of the project.

The project was far more specific on two other areas in comparison to earlier Ford-funded LDP projects. The handbook clearly outlined the participants' obligations to the program, including participating in a monitoring process. Progress reports were required after each training sequence and the handbook outlined the type of information that should be included, such as who provided the training, what happened during the training, and how participants would evaluate the experience for themselves and others. It also asked the participant to evaluate the effect of the experience on his/her own leadership ability at home. The handbook also specified that there would be an evaluation and that participants were expected to assist in this process, although there are no more specifics about the evaluation plan indicated.

Another difference in this project, which appeared to relate to evaluation of the weaknesses of the previous LDP projects, was an emphasis on assisting the fellow in the reentry process, when the fellow returned to his/her home community. According to the handbook, fellows would be assisted in returning to their home community work by the program director, coordinator or their mentor, and through a process of consultation by phone, letter, or in person with tribal and community leaders, school administrators and employers. This consultation, according to the handbook, would

deal with the "... objectives of AIELD and the returning fellow's role in education management and leadership." This process was to begin approximately one month prior to the end of training. It was intended to help each fellow define his/her new role and status in the community and to reestablish old working relationships—the reentry difficulty having been cited as one of the weaknesses of the early LDP projects by the evaluation reports.

Since this project only started last year (1976), there was no evaluation information available. However, two Alaskans, Dolly Jensen of Ketchikan and Yolande Muhic of Dillingham, were chosen to participate in the first year of training. The investigator wrote to each of them and enclosed a list of questions to assess their participation in the project, although it was still in process. One participant spent part of her training time at CNER, and both responded to the interview questions. Both had developed a personal learning plan related to personal objectives and were at that time choosing training experiences, conferences, et cetera, to meet their objectives. Both felt this individual approach was very valuable: they also valued the group meetings which gave them an opportunity to become more knowledgeable about experiences and resources available outside Alaska, and allowed them to meet with other participants in the program.

In response to being asked for their opinion on the need for a leadership training program for Alaska Natives, both responded positively. One suggested opening such a program to all Indians with Alaska Natives given first preference. The other noted that the University would probably be a good place to start such a program but that Natives already in leadership roles should be involved, not necessarily just those people with degrees. In response to the question as to whether the program should take place wholly in Alaska, both mentioned the importance of resources outside Alaska. One added:

One of the things I liked about the two workshops I attended was meeting and talking with people from other parts of the country and learning from them about what they are doing.

Both Alaskan participants had mentors from outside the state; halfway through the program, the participants indicated that they were not receiving the guidance that they had expected. It remained to be seen how this would be resolved. One said she was sorry she had not known that she could choose her mentor rather than using the prescribed list, as she would have preferred someone within the state to work with her. The other noted that she had tried to contact her mentor, had not heard from him, but had recently learned he had just resigned from his job.

In reviewing their training plans, both women indicated considerable interest in personal development, including strengthening their own assertiveness and being better able to deal with conflict situations and other personal growth skills as well as those more concrete skills such as proposal writing, conducting meetings, and problem-solving techniques. Both also mentioned subject-specific skills, including acquiring more knowledge about alcohol and drug abuse and special education. Although it was not mentioned in the material supplied by the organization, the women reported that NITRC was sponsoring several group workshops for the participants where they would be meeting together and studying specific objectives or skill areas. (The need for participants to get together and interact in group skill training, in addition to their individual experiences, had been noted by the evaluator of earlier LDP programs. This particular problem appeared to be addressed by NITRC.)

It is hoped that the evaluation of this program will be specific to both the process to which participants were exposed and to the product, in terms of the skills participants learned and how they were able to use them in their home communities. This program appeared to have incorporated the best aspects of the former LDP concept along with attempting to correct some of its weaknesses. Evaluation of such a program could be very useful to those planning future programs.

The possibility of building upon this program for Alaska and coordinating with it were among the most positive aspects of the review of outside programs. This program was funded for three years, and it was hoped that its success would attract funds to continue its support beyond that point. It also bears watching as to whether the program could be cost-effective enough to be continued without foundation support.

II. LOOKING WITHIN ALASKA

Interviews with Selected Native Leaders

This part of the report summarizes the collection and analysis of data for that portion of the project which occurred within the State of Alaska. These data were gathered by interviewing Alaska "Native Leaders" and asking their opinions on what a University-sponsored Native leadership program might include.³⁴ This phase of the project is described in two sections, Procedures and Summary of the Interviews. Additional selected material is presented in the Appendices.

PROCEDURES

The first task was to prepare a list of influential Alaska Natives. Lists of suggested names were gathered from nearly a dozen people familiar with Native leadership in the state (each person being asked to cite ten leaders), as well as from other sources.

While the list was being gathered, an interview schedule was developed to sample the opinions of Natives chosen to be interviewed. Several rough drafts and critical evaluations by CNER staff members and a trial interview preceded the final interview schedule.³⁵

Before the schedule could be used, the selection of "Native Leaders" to be interviewed had to be completed. The selection was made from a compilation of the influential Natives named by the previously cited sources. Ninety names were noted, including 68 males and 22 females, and the frequency each name appeared was tabulated. The greatest number of times any one name appeared was eleven. The initial cut-off for individuals to be considered for interviewing was set at five, and fourteen people met this cut-off requirement.

Following the identification of the fourteen primary interview candidates, letters were sent to each of them, followed up by a telephone call, to ascertain the individual's willingness to be interviewed, and to schedule a time for an interview appointment (see Appendix A for letter). Neither initial contact by telephone nor actual contact with the primary candidates was easy to make. Frequently half-a-dozen phone calls were needed to arrange an interview, and there were two people with whom contact never was established. Furthermore, once interviews were scheduled, they often were postponed, rescheduled, or cancelled by the person to be interviewed.

Eventually, over a three-month period, seven members of the original target group of fourteen were interviewed. In addition to these seven people, three other Natives appearing on the original master list of names were interviewed. In making those additions, sex, geographic distribution, as well as frequency of mention were considered. The ten people interviewed came from a variety of areas in the state including Barrow, Dillingham, Fairbanks, Anchorage, Yakutat, and several places in interior and southeast Alaska. Of the interviews that were completed, seven were with men, and three with women. The following summation is based on these interviews.

SUMMARY OF THE INTERVIEWS

Educational Background of Those Interviewed

Most of those interviewed attended village elementary schools. While some remained in rural areas for their secondary education, many attended Mt. Edgecombe (BIA boarding high school in Sitka, Alaska). Several have had post-secondary experience, while a few attended graduate school or have had internships.

Of the obstacles encountered in their educations, the inferior quality of elementary and secondary education was recurrently mentioned.

³⁴For an explanation of why "Native Leaders" appears in quotation marks, see Epilogue, p. 70. A list of those interviewed is included in Appendix D.

³⁵The interview schedule and initial contact letter are included in Appendix C.

An inadequate elementary and secondary education made it extremely difficult at post-secondary level; the content was not designed for college.

I didn't graduate from Nenana, matter of fact, I quit with about six or eight weeks to go. My teachers advised me to stay in school for the big degree, the diploma. I told them, no, I don't feel comfortable, I don't want the thing because the school hasn't been very fair to me as a Native person, not even as a person, so I don't want your diploma.

In our education, we had to be taken from the family unity which disrupted our family completely. We went thousands of miles and weren't able to get home Christmas or any other holidays or even summers. There was absolutely no communication, no telephones, of course, and many times no radio, no TV. But the main thing, I think, was poor quality of education. Very sub-standard education.

Schools that were patterned, just about completely after those that were meant for New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago. Therefore, I didn't get to study any of my own things from where I came from . . . begin to realize that text books were not meant for you, not meant for the Eskimos, but were meant for, like I said, New York and other places like that. Therefore, we also noticed along the way, in textbooks, they were belittling other people, like the Indians and Russians and other peoples of the world, because they were different cultures and all that . . . You began to feel as if something was wrong . . . I began to feel a little bit ashamed of my igloo. It was very nice and warm, comfortable, and instead, I even began to envy those who had frame structure houses. I couldn't figure it out for a long while and later on I figured it out; it was through the textbooks that we used, which were altogether foreign to us. trains were unknown to us, cows, horses, highways, and all that.

Work History of Those Interviewed

During their youth, a majority of Natives interviewed said their families lived in a "subsistence" way. During and after their education, they pursued various careers. Many of the men began supporting themselves by fishing, lumbering and working in construction. Several of the women spent the first years of their careers as office personnel, while others worked in the area of Public Health. All are now active in making important decisions at village, regional, and state levels; they are in the mainstream of decision-making in this state.

Most of my work has been in fishing and construction. I started fishing before I started high school and fished for most of the next fifteen years or so except when I was in the army. Then I fished off and on for another four or five years during which time I was also working in construction as a carpenter and pile-buck.

When I came to Anchorage fourteen years ago, I started out working as a secretary for a temporary jobs agency in town. Then I went from there to take a state government job with the Division of Aviation, and got interested in getting my skills upgraded for secretarial work, and started taking night courses. I transferred to another department and got more interested in getting a degree. So I kept going to night school. Later, I transferred to the Department of Education and worked there for seven years in various positions . . . Then I went to work for Senator Hensley and the Alaska Federation of Natives as a personal assistant. I worked with him in the legislature as well as with the Federation, and acted more as a general manager for administrative purposes . . . Then, I resigned at the Federation, and took a job as a special assistant for the Commissioner of Education because education is my real interest and that's where I like to be. And I'm still here.

As is clear in the above comments, an occupational evolution is taking place among some Natives.

Need for Native Leaders

As Native enterprises continue to grow in Alaska, so will the number of decisions to be made by Natives. While those interviewed might argue with being labeled "leaders," they agreed that more Alaska Natives are needed to make decisions about their communities.

The availability of qualified, young, aggressive leaders is at a premium. We have a small base of leaders that are capable of taking leadership positions, and those people that are available are being snapped up by every regional and village corporation in the state. Not only that, but other companies are very eagerly searching for young, aggressive people that have experience in rural Alaska.

There is a real need in this state for qualified Natives in finance and business administration. We also need management for both public and private corporations.

I don't think we are using all the resources that we should use—particularly, the leadership quality of women is not being used as much as it should be.

If the University of Alaska doesn't do something in the way of a Native leadership program, I am sure other programs will spring up to fill this need of Native leadership development because the need for additional young Native leaders, if not young, at least new Native leaders, is presently great and will grow in the future.

Characteristics of Leaders and Potential Leaders

What kinds of people will best fit into decision-making positions? What characteristics should a potential "leader" have? Some respondents said that a leader is aggressive and thinks well of himself.

... you are out in front, but you don't know if you are being chased or being followed. Quite often that's the case. It's a matter of your own concept of yourself. I think you have to have a terrific ego. You've got to really like yourself. If you don't it shows, other people pick it up. A lot of things working-in here, but you have to be able to say you're sorry; I think that's a necessary quality of leadership. And the ability to remain silent when you hear someone saying something you feel is really wrong, to give yourself time to consider the other person's point-of-view with great care and deliberation, despite how it effects your own philosophy; the ability to pull yourself out from a situation and look at it as objectively as possible. All these things are very definite requirements for being a leader.

Other Natives said a leader should be a sincere person.

Stress open communication and respect. You notice there are some of our Native leaders who have never lived in a village, they really don't understand our Native culture. I'm not against them, but they don't have the respect that the "head men" instilled in us, whether it's to the old, sick, or to the little ones. They are coming on quite loud and clear, but they're really losing out with respect for our older people—that's part of our culture. A leader must have open communication, and above all, the ability to live with those people who are unable to travel, those people in the village; to give them a break, and help them learn. The more we leave

them without education or without communicating what we're doing, the weaker they get, and that's a cop-out.

Another way to locate potential leaders would be to look at their track record.

... people who show latent signs of leadership would benefit most from the program. Showing latent signs would mean having established some kind of track record prior to entering the program; starting and accomplishing tasks, demonstrating leadership potential, et cetera.

Obstacles to Entering a Leadership Program

Recognizing leadership potential is one important aspect of selecting program applicants; deciding what things might keep qualified candidates out of the program is another. It was mentioned that using the term "leader" or "leadership" might keep some people from applying to the program:

I wouldn't call myself a Native leader. I think that's assuming a little bit too much. When you place yourself in a Native leadership program, you are assuming that you have leadership capability, and that you will come out with more ability to lead your people. A lot of people, Native people, will have difficulty with the term "leadership." I just think that most Native people are unassuming, so the term itself may be a little bit of a problem.

Not only a poor choice of titles might keep people from applying to the program, but also the explicit relevance of the program to a graduate's employment is an issue.

A lack of incentive built into the program might keep them from applying. The program must have a place for the graduates to go to exercise the skills they learned ... an incentive of a built-in place to exercise their skills.

Of course, as in any program, availability of potential participants and their willingness to interrupt their present pattern of living must be considered.

Time involvement for one thing. The kinds of activities that the people are into that you might be interested in, just the unwillingness to take the time away from whatever is going on. That would be a primary factor.

Recruiting Candidates

While locating a "Native Leader"—and thus a potential program participant—is no easy task, there were several suggestions for program recruitment which surfaced during the interviews.

It's up to us or the University to go out to where the people are. A picture in Tundra Times is really great, even the News-Miner and the "weeklies"; a picture story would do a lot. You've got to hit "Tundra Topics" and "Trappers Chatter" [radio message programs]. And then get out there to the schools. Get there and go to that school, along with the school board and parents. Don't have a letter saying "everybody sign up, because in two months we're going to have a program," and then forget them. They're fed up with this. Alyeska did it, Tanana Land Claims College did it, and both of them failed. I think it's important not to just go out there once and yak about the program. You have to follow through and make the people feel welcome.

I think you might want to contact the Regional Corporation. I am aware of the efforts of the Bristol Bay Native Corporation to begin to train young people who may have or

demonstrate an ability in executive leadership. They are developing a program at this time See what kind of requirements they have adopted to implement the program they're talking about.

Tack up a notice in the post office, community hall, or if they have movies, that's a neat place to have a bulletin board. Everybody reads that bulletin board, especially in the post office while they are standing in line getting mail or packages. Now that there are the sub-regions, these offices are a good place, and in the village stores, they have a place for little notices. Get them hung up and like any notice, very simple, with good lettering.

I wouldn't rely too much on formalizing procedures for recruitment. I suppose you have to have some sort of starting point, but there are a variety of ways of recruiting, a variety of ways of communicating with and getting in contact with people and I don't know that any single approach would be adequate. Word of mouth? Certainly the qualifications of the person that would be in charge would be important. I'm not too big on the idea of getting in a credentialed person. What you need is a person who can communicate with a variety of people, and somehow, using his or her own imagination, pull in the recruits. There should be an advertising budget, certainly, putting out wires, radio, TV, whatever fits for the area that you want to get into, maybe presentations to various groups.

Application Procedures

In addition to the above suggestions, an application form would help screen prospective candidates. Beyond the usual personal history information, many felt such a form should try to solicit a commitment by program applicants to stick with the program and to help their communities after they completed the program.

If the person has a history of starting a task and not finishing it, that would prevent them from participating in a Native leadership program.

What I would ask the person, if I was looking for somebody to do something is, "What do you think of the problem?" Have you got it in your heart strong enough that it would perhaps give you an impetus to do something more about it, and try to solve it for the good of your people, and for yourself, and try to go on from there.

I'd say, in identifying Alaska Natives, who is available is important, and who is going to follow through on it, and who is going to stay there, but even if they move they'll be useful in another area, too. Above all, who is going to follow through and use the thing.

Rather than asking why an applicant wants to participate in a program, it would be better to give the applicant an opportunity to begin addressing his/her goals and objectives in life . . . I think anyone who gets into the program will have to know why he or she is getting into that program. They need to have the opportunity to sit down and think it out in their minds and to get it down on paper. Going through that process alone may convince them that maybe they don't want to get into the program and they shouldn't be there if they don't want to.

In almost every interview, people felt that letters of recommendation could be useful in candidate selection. However, no one interviewed felt that letters of recommendation alone would be adequate criteria for selection.

Letters of recommendation do help to give you an idea about an applicant, but I wouldn't accept letters of recommendation alone as an alternative way to select participants.

Academic Criteria

Among other selection criteria discussed were desirable academic requirements. Academic achievement such as secondary or post-secondary diplomas were infrequently listed as requirements. The single most important scholastic variable mentioned was the ability to read and write English.

I can think of people who have a pretty good job with minimal education, less than grade school. If a person can read and write that would certainly be helpful and, of course, the nature of your program will have to be taken into account as well. If the program courses require a lot of reading, the ability to read and write becomes a real must (unless we build into the program some way of assisting those people who have problems in these areas).

If a person is a bilingual teacher, or a teacher's aide in a village, or in charge of the corporation—non-profit or profit, they're educated—more so than those with a bachelor's degree. There should be no educational requirements.

... I have witnessed in my own village where some people couldn't read or write. But they knew the situation in their own villages, and they knew the village problems. Judging from their knowledge (probably without knowledge of English or reading), they were able to do something about those village problems. Under the circumstances right now, we have to deal with Washington, D.C., and the State of Alaska, and everything else, so the ability to read and write and understand English is a very good thing to have.

Yet some of those interviewed would require program participants to have high school degrees and post-secondary experience:

I would select number four [referring to questionnaire, section III, C.4], two years of post-secondary education. Number one preference, of course, would be a bachelor's degree experience, that really helped me. I was an older student when I went through it, but college education is an excellent experience. I just can't overemphasize how important it is to go beyond high school.

Age Limits

As mentioned above, some Natives who have successfully completed University programs were "older students." This raises the question of age limits for program participants. Throughout the interviews, limiting participants by age did not seem a matter of great concern. The only age consideration referred to not recruiting teenagers for a leadership program until after they graduated from high school.

Obviously, you don't want to interrupt the secondary education program of kids still in high school, who might be attracted to going into something else because they think it might be an alternative way of getting their education.

I'd like to see the kids in high school get their high school diploma. We're pulling a lot of kids out of school on short-term studies and we're disrupting their education. They come in and take a kid who is really high school age and disrupt a four-year education that I think those kids need. Believe me, I'd hate to see them disrupt the high school age group, even though a GED is easy to get these days. Don't disrupt that high school education.

Candidate Interviews

It was felt that more than paperwork and various academic criteria or limitations would be useful in selecting candidates. There was agreement among those interviewed that, if the resources and logistics of the program allowed, a personal interview would be useful—if not necessary—for candidate selection. There was some disagreement, however, about the mechanics of the interviews. The major area of contention was where to conduct the interviews.

I'd take him out of his own environment and put him into a very different one; to test poise, articulation and the ability to cope with a new situation. Yes, I'd make it very difficult for the applicant.

I feel as close to home as possible. You always get a better picture of the person when they are relaxed and comfortable and on known ground. Bringing a person in from one of the villages—you know that person is going to react very differently in an urban setting. If you can talk to a person in his own village, I think that would be very worthwhile.

Perhaps in both places. You probably would get much more straight-from-the-shoulder answers at his village and somewhat watered down in an institution like the University of Alaska, unless he has been there and has some added background experience like having gone to school and graduated or something like that.

Yet, while the location of a personal interview brought varied responses, answers to a question about the type of person who should conduct the interview seemed to emphasize a sensitivity to Native peoples as an important variable.

It needs to be someone like Ray Barnhart. Someone who has a certain kind of sensitivity to people, insight into their responses, that kind of thing. Someone who is able to project what responses mean in regard to a person's participation in the program and that's not an easy task.

Of course, if an interview is at the corporate level, a corporate executive should conduct it. At the University level, someone who is sensitive to the Native mentality—a Native way of looking at things—should conduct the interviews.

Other Selection Suggestions

In addition to the above ways of selecting program participants, other ideas for identifying Natives who would benefit most from a leadership program were brought up. It was frequently mentioned that any leadership program should not overlook people from rural areas.

... people from the remote villages. I think if there were a chance for people from places like Arctic Village, or Anaktuvuk Pass, or some of the very small villages to participate in a program like this, and then go back to the villages and in some way provide the leadership that is needed, it would be good. Most programs attract people that live in the urban areas, who are familiar with the urban areas, but not in the bush. My own feeling is that villagers are going to remain in their areas. They're not going to abandon them, and there's not going to be a large influx of people from bush areas to urban sites. There may be some influx, but I think with the land claims settlement, those people in the bush are apt to stay there. They need the leadership out there, to find ways to provide an economic base, and be able to implement the Land Claims Act at a local level; to be able to contribute to the education of their children through the school board, community school committees, or anything else at a local level.

Planning the Program

The previous sections review comments on the type of people who might benefit most from a leadership program as well as how to identify, recruit, and select them. No specific program is yet described. An initial step in developing any program is planning. Most who were interviewed suggested that those affected by the program should help plan it. It seems, however, that a variety of persons involved in the many aspects of contemporary life in Alaska Native communities could be affected by a leadership program. Native manpower needs from village school board to corporation management might be served by graduates from a leadership program. Thus, it was no surprise to find varied—sometimes dissimilar—opinions on who should plan and evaluate a leadership program.

You want to pick out your high-powered business people in the state . . . chief administrators in the state government, also the chief administrators in the federal government; . . . any one of the members who have certain executive, administrative ability, this caliber of person.

Not just administrators should serve on the planning committee. A lot of times these administrators are just trying to find out how much money they can get for a program and staff to expand their own programs and staff.

In planning for a leadership training project, one item can be taken as a “given”—the program should be planned so that students receive academic credit.

So many times Indians take courses, and we don't even get a thank you, let alone compensation or credit. While at the same time, somebody else is usually getting a doctorate, or something, and we are the ones left out. If that student is working towards something they should get the credit.

Academic credit is part of the incentive and it would be good that way, but it's not enough incentive alone.

Program Content: Coursework and Internships

There was also much agreement on the roles coursework and work experience should play in a leadership program. Many commented that coursework and work experience should be combined in a leadership program. Furthermore, several felt this combination should be weighted to emphasize work experience, that the program should stress practical application of theories learned in the classroom. Several specifically mentioned an internship as a type of work experience.

I would advise combining coursework and internship/work experience. A combination is important because people need the theoretical tools and skills they can get in courses, but coursework without a chance to apply theoretical skills is nonsense.

I think you ought to work in a combination of the two (coursework and work experience), because practical application of theory is probably the best groundwork for development that you can possibly ever hope to achieve. If I were to read about the legislative process, which I have done, but not become involved in it, I couldn't be a very good instructor on the legislative process; there's nothing better than melding the two together. I would emphasize the work.

More emphasis on the internship. There's just too much tendency for universities to do a lot of course work. Sometimes the kind of coursework that gets

into this kind of program is a lot of "Mickey Mouse" stuff, and I think that turns a lot of people off.

It might help to look at Anchorage's attempt a couple or three years ago to train or develop leaders in the Native community. It was a community college program. It did not have an internship component with it and that might have been one of the reasons for its downfall. It turned out many people, but very few good leaders.

Several specific areas of coursework and work experiences were mentioned during the interviews. Interviewees felt a leadership program's courses should focus on areas dealing with administration, management, finance, land resources, the Native Claims Settlement Act, and human relations.

Courses in administration and management should be offered by the University, and also courses that would help people to be comptrollers, and be able to handle and understand money so that they could make responsible investments of their Native Corporation stockholders' funds. Responsible investments and monetary profit alone, however, is not enough. Courses also must remind the students that they are Natives, and that being a Native is just as important, if not more so, than making a profit for the stockholders.

For one thing, you should acquaint students with the Alaska Native Land Claims Learning to speak to an audience is a good thing, and learning to sit down with your peers, even though one might be white, one might be Eskimo, one might be Indian. Here again, I believe human relations would be handy to have as background.

University courses, especially management courses, must consider the different philosophical perspectives of Natives. The University must be sensitive to Native differences without setting Natives apart from the rest of the student body.

While the University could best provide theoretical groundwork for program participants, it was evident that respondents felt those involved with the program must go beyond purely academic experiences to complete their training. The most often cited work-internship experience is with Native Corporations, either at the regional or village level. Other useful work experiences would include on-the-job training with government agencies (municipal, state, or federal), or private industry.

Internships and work experience in Native corporations, at both the regional and village level, are important. At both the regional and village level, the profit-making corporations is where the emphasis should be placed, but I would not eliminate placing an intern in a non-profit Native corporation. Interns could also be placed in government positions. These government internship positions could be at the rural, municipal, state, or federal level.

I think a lot of on-the-job training programs are going to be developed at regional corporations, where they are going to take the inexperienced person who demonstrates the ability to lead and to put them right on the job.

It would behoove the leaders to have someone assigned to them as an intern. Those guys are really able to do a lot and I think it would behoove them to allow someone to get the benefit of what they are doing. That's the kind of leadership program that I'd like to see developed.

I think associating yourself with people in business is a very definite plus for a program of this kind. You have to rub elbows with these people and break down the barriers that may exist in your own mind like what happened to me.

To coordinate coursework and work experience, it was suggested that linkage mechanism would be useful. This mechanism could be provided by either the Student Orientation Services or the Rural Educational Affairs office at the University. Outside of the University, groups like Alaska Federation of Natives or Alaska Native Foundation could help coordinate program activities.

Group and Individual Activities

There was also agreement that a well-coordinated program should offer a balance of flexible group and individual activities. Most respondents seemed to feel that participants should experience group interaction in their courses, while their work experience and/or internship should provide them with a more individualized learning situation.

In the classroom situation, I would encourage a group. In the individual experiences, there may be some people who are not going to really want to be, say, a public administrator in a Bureau of Land Management or administrator in the office of an oil company. Work experience should be fitted to the individual. In the group experience you could bring all of these individual experiences together and come up with a pretty effective dialogue on how certain problems are handled and the differences between the federal, state, and private sectors. That kind of understanding would be very important.

While it seems advisable to have most people start and finish a course together, the academic structure should not be so rigid that advanced students would be held back if they could finish their work before the rest of the group. Conversely, if some students need special tutoring to finish a class, or require longer to complete their assignments, the program should allow for this.³⁶

I favor people starting together, but be flexible enough so that people who are able to exceed or excel and go faster than the main body of people they started with are allowed to do so, and finish at their own rate. If they are fast students, they shouldn't be held back . . . If a person is deficient in an area, such as the ability to read or write English, but he's a potential candidate for the leadership program, then help him out with special tutoring so that he can get through the academic section of the program.

I don't think you ought to make it mandatory that all finish at the same time. If a person shows a particular aptitude and it appears to be wasted time, I think you ought to just get him out of there, get him to work, get him producing.

Other Program Suggestions

Many people suggested having guest speakers from work-related areas given lectures in program courses. Also, it would be useful to take classes on field trips. These field trips could be to places related to course content, or any place where decision-making takes place.

One of the things that should be required is attending places where people in high positions, like the governor, senators, and all, are being interviewed, giving

³⁶In University technology an "incomplete" could provide a way of extending course length. However, it should be made clear that incomplete means unfinished, not unable to complete. A better word would be "extension," so as not to discourage Natives unfamiliar with academic terminology.

speeches, or something like that. Participants should be encouraged to attend some of these things; once you're there, you usually are face-to-face with somebody who is leading, who is a leader.

Let's say a course is being held at Galena because it's a sub-regional village and the hub of many villages, or Fort Yukon, or other community colleges. Let's say that there is a sub-regional corporation meeting, or a city council meeting that is open to the public. Then take your class in to experience this. Even if it's just a school board meeting—which is very important—have your course hear this out. If something important is happening in Fairbanks, then it's an opportune time for a trip; there are meetings there every day. Maybe a trip should be scheduled so a whole class could experience the first or second day of the Tanana Chief's Conference, and listen to leaders from every different level, every different type of education. It is really super education to see them in action.

Timing and Duration

There were mixed opinions about the importance of the timing of a leadership program. Almost everyone seemed to agree that a quality program must go beyond a mere workshop, and the most common length for a program mentioned was about one year. In that year, however, the importance of paying attention to the seasons appeared debatable. Some say program participants must make a sacrifice and concentrate their efforts on finishing the program, regardless of the seasons. Others, although agreeing with one year as an approximate length for a program, felt it would be unwise to disregard the necessity for most people to work in seasonal jobs or village-based activities.

As far as the villages are concerned, including young people, there is always a period of activity to make a living for the coming winter. Those things should be considered.

The feeling used to be that you had to do things according to the seasons out in the bush, because people often went fishing and you had to pay some attention to this subsistence way of life. But I don't think that's the case anymore. If you are going to attract someone into a program, they are obviously going to have to give up some other kinds of things, if the program is something they want to do very badly. I don't think the time of year makes an awful lot of difference.

Considering the mixed feelings about timing, it might make sense to offer individual options for entering and exiting the program. Depending on the student, a semester or two of full-time coursework would be long enough for her or him to learn academic fundamentals—with “extensions” available when needed. Again, depending on the experience of a student, an internship could begin as early as the second semester of the program, or as late as a student's “extension” required.

Funding

Until now, a “program” has been examined as though its birth were certain. However, that is not the case because funding sources for such a Native leadership program are, as yet, uncertain. During the interviews, all possible sources of funding suggested in the interview schedule were recommended; some were cited more than others (sources suggested were: University of Alaska, program participants, federal government, Native corporations and/or associations, other sources).

The more frequently chosen combination of funding included the University of Alaska and Native corporations. It was suggested that if the University could help defray costs for coursework, the Native corporations could help out by bearing the costs of internships and work experiences; a

partnership might be formed that would alleviate any great financial burdens for program participants.

The regional corporations are going to be the beneficiaries; I think the regional corporations ought to pick up some percent of the cost. If they are going to use that individual they ought to pick up a good share of it. I don't know what percentage I'd put on it. As far as the program participants go, in most cases, I don't think you ought to put the burden on them. They ought to be subsidized, I'm not sure by who—the State of Alaska could be very interested.

The University should probably take about 50%; program participant, according to his means; federal government, 30%; Native corporations about 10% or somewhere; plus private grants should be encouraged. Some foundations are interested in this; they should be given what is being planned and what manner the thing is going to be done. They should be given knowledge of these things.

... the State should give some money.

I'd say that if the University were going to sponsor such a program, then the University ought to dig up the money.

Summary

An overview of the proposed leadership program can be obtained by viewing how some of those interviewed summarized projected program goals.

In its initial phase, the Native leadership program should try to turn out a few good leaders in the areas most needed by Native corporations—finance, business, public administration and so forth.

... To select as many qualified people as you can, as soon as possible. To get them through the program, and get them producing. That would be one of the major goals—get them producing so that they are contributing something to the State of Alaska.

In addition to the above goals, some suggestions were made that might make a University-sponsored program more effective.

Any University-sponsored program must have a revised philosophy about Natives. The program should not try to make Natives like whites. The University must realize that many ethnic groups can live side-by-side in a society, with each retaining its cultural integrity.

In reviewing the summary of data gathered during the interviews as has been presented, the reader will probably agree that few "conclusions" have been reached. Rather, the data suggest several directions a University-sponsored Native leadership program might take, and would strongly appear to support the piloting of a variety of programs rather than any one format. It should also be noted that none of the leaders interviewed said that the University should not develop a Native leadership program or that a program was not needed or that it belonged better elsewhere, although several cautions about the way the University should carry out such an effort were voiced.

Epilogue

Since several of those interviewed disagreed with being called "leaders," and others weren't

convinced that "leaders" could be "trained," it seems appropriate to add some of their comments.

First, I don't like to be called a Native leader . . . this is a personal kind of feeling, but I think it's one shared by other Native people whom you will contact in your interviews.

I never had any ambitions to be a leader or anything like that at all. In fact, I feel the same way as I did 20 years ago. I was sort of a curious person as a young man, and I wanted to find out how the people outside lived; what they ate, what they did. I got into the swim of it pretty much, got acquainted with the students at the University of Washington, went swimming, picnicking, all that; and, therefore, I got into the swim of things pretty well. I don't know whether that was any help to what I managed to become, but it must have rubbed off some way. I've never really yet tried specifically to get anything, to gain anything for leadership purposes. It never entered my mind.

III. PLANNING LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS FOR ALASKA NATIVES AND OTHERS: SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

This report has been based upon a planning study designed to develop leadership programs responsive to Alaska Native needs. This final chapter highlights those factors which planners of leadership programs should consider and makes suggestions with special reference to the Alaskan scene. The comments are based upon an analysis of the experiences of leadership programs outside Alaska (cf. Chapter II) and the interviews with Native leaders (cf. Chapter III).

The recommendations which follow continue to be based upon the assumption that the University should be involved in developing leadership programs and in assisting students to participate in existing programs, such as those described in Appendix B. It appears that a University-sponsored program could use University resources while simultaneously orienting more Native students to the University. The study findings, which included the almost universal desire for a credit option in any leadership program plus expressed interest in including some of the more traditional University courses, further strengthened the rationale for a University program. Also, the recommendations specify the need for practical experience through internships; such field placements would be carefully selected and coordinated with other aspects of the program. The University could provide such a function.

However, it should be emphasized that the suggested University sponsorship of leadership programs does not imply isolation; indeed, the recommendations require just the opposite. Native groups and other organizations need to be involved in recruitment efforts and the essential program elements of individual internships and group learning situations.

From the preceding pages, it is obvious that there are no generally agreed-upon models to guide designers of leadership programs; further, those who designed and administered leadership programs; further, those who designed and administered leadership programs seldom shared their experiences. One reason for this seemed to be that programs rarely were evaluated in a meaningful way; even when they were, such information was not readily available. Among available literature, there was no source book of collected suggestions emerging from specific leadership programs; neither were there general guidelines for program planners.

The authors do not promote any one particular program; they suggest that planning a meaningful leadership program is a complex task that requires consideration of a wide variety of factors before a specific plan is implemented. This chapter attempts to generate a list of considerations for planners. Some of the factors listed below include specific program suggestions while others are intended to raise questions and alert planners to possible problem areas.

Although the analysis in this report was based, in part, upon the opinions of Alaska Native leaders, it is hoped that the suggestions presented here will be useful to a broad spectrum of persons, both inside and outside Alaska. It is also hoped that this initial attempt to synthesize available data on leadership programs will encourage others to better describe and evaluate their programs and to share their experiences.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Need for a Leadership Program

The sample of Alaskan Native leaders interviewed in the study was small and not necessarily representative of all interests, although the principal investigator was pleased by the willingness of most contacted to take time from their busy schedules. With that caution in mind, the principal investigator found general agreement with the need for some type of leadership training for Alaska Natives and others, and with the possibility that the university might develop and pilot such a program. However, the authors found no consensus on the type of program which should be implemented, either from looking at programs conducted outside Alaska or from discussing this topic with Alaska Natives. Therefore, it seems reasonable that if the University is to develop Native

leadership training, it should pilot more than one program. Although any one program might be flexible, the variety of needs within potential audiences is such that multiple approaches may be necessary to be the most successful with the largest variety of people.

Model Programs

All seven leadership programs described in this report could be thought of as models, since each has something to offer to persons designing new programs. Descriptive information on program factors, such as program structure and content, applicant and selection procedures, and methods of funding; and evaluative information on which program aspects succeeded or failed, should be carefully studied by those planning new leadership training programs. (It is unfortunate that so little evaluative information is publicly available to guide others in new efforts.)

Of the seven programs reviewed, and in the opinion of the principal investigator, one program clearly stands out as being most closely related to the Alaskan situation—the American Indian Education Leadership Development Program, administered by NITRC. Although the most recent of the programs studied, it had the advantage, through its Ford Foundation sponsorship, of the collective wisdom obtained by the Foundation's long involvement in leadership training. It appeared to be designed on the basis of the knowledge gained from previous Ford leadership program efforts. (Of the seven programs studied, at least four were substantially or wholly supported by the Ford Foundation.) The progress of the AIELD program should be monitored carefully by anyone in Alaska seeking to initiate a leadership training program.

Program Structure: Need for Flexibility

The overall sentiment expressed by Alaskans interviewed could be summed up as the need for flexibility. Although programs outside Alaska can serve as useful models, Alaska's geography, cultures, climate, and economy make it a unique setting. A myriad of differences demand certain considerations not required elsewhere if a program is to be tailored to the needs of the target audience rather than expecting participants to conform to the strictures of a program. During the interviews, comments such as the need to consider the seasonal aspect of subsistence lifestyles, the problem of young village leaders being called away from home too frequently, and the wide range of educational experiences of those emerging as leaders, spoke to a general concern for designing a flexible and nontraditional program.

Program Name

Related to considering the need for a leadership program in Alaska is selecting a name for that program. The Alaska Natives who were interviewed for this study had been nominated as being leaders but several, as noted, expressed discomfort with the label. If "Leader" is not a culturally acceptable term among the audience such a program would be designed to attract, another word should be used in naming the program. (As an example of "What's in a name?" the original title of this planning study used the term "University-based." Since this appeared to indicate to some that we were suggesting planning a program to be physically located at the University, we almost immediately changed the title to "University-sponsored.")

Program Goals: Community/Career

From the review of leadership programs outside Alaska, a fundamental question in designing a leadership program appears to be deciding whether a goal of the program is: (1) to assist the participant to change his/her career and/or advance to another position in a new setting, or (2) to assist the person to advance in his/her current job within the home community. Although these ideas are not necessarily incompatible, leaving the question unanswered lead to a confusion of purposes in at least one program reviewed, the City-University Educational Leadership Programs. Programs which stimulated participants to think in terms of career changes often resulted in persons

going to new locales, either by choice or necessity, to seek advancement opportunities rather than returning to their pre-program positions or institutions. Whether this outcome is desirable or not depends on the intent of the program. For instance, those programs reviewed which brought participants to Washington, D.C., to intern in agencies, often noted that participants tended to stay in the Washington, D.C., area. (Whether participants applied to the program in order to find a job in Washington, D.C., or whether it was the program experience that led them to seek this change was not addressed.) If the intent of these programs was to increase the policy-making awareness of people outside the capital city, for participants to remain there would not meet the program's goals. Once this fundamental decision as to program goals is answered, the direction the program takes might be very different.

The Participants

The question of who should participate in a leadership training program was not resolved. Many with whom we spoke suggested Alaska Natives should have first priority but that the program should be open to other groups such as rural Alaskans and non-Alaskan Indians.

It would appear that participants in a general leadership program should be of mixed ages. Judging from the East-West Center's experience and the Alaska Native cultural context, it might prove valuable to mix older people of more traditional learning with younger persons who perhaps have had more education but less experience. The evaluator of the Leadership Development Program found persons of about 30 years of age best suited to that program. The ideal age indeed might be younger in Alaska, where recognized positions of responsibility often seem to be filled by persons of younger ages than occur elsewhere in the country.

The interviews with Alaska Native leaders also suggested some interest in a specialized audience for a leadership program, one which would be directed toward the training of personnel for the Regional Native Corporations, with an emphasis on business subjects. Whether it would be a program to upgrade the education of those already working at the corporations or a program to prepare people to take on such duties after program completion was not clear. However, several of those interviewed also mentioned the Native Corporations as a source of funding for leadership programs.

Community Involvement

If this leadership program is to be long-term and one of its priorities related to community involvement, then importance of the tie between the participant and the community base is essential. This was demonstrated by the previously described Ford Leadership Development Program. A program of more than several months probably would require that the participant return to his/her home community for a pre-determined period to relate his/her learning objectives to community needs and keep contacts current. This should help prevent participant and community from feelings of alienation which long-term training programs away from home seem to generate and also should mitigate against the so-called reentry problem.

Community involvement might be encouraged at several other stages in the process of developing and administering a leadership program in Alaska: recruiting applicants, developing placement locations for field experience, providing instructors in traditional cultures and skills, and planning and evaluation processes.

Recruitment Strategy

Spokesmen for at least two leadership training programs reviewed mentioned that most applicants expressed surprise at being selected. The fact that this same comment was made about the two most dissimilar programs—the ones with the least and most experienced clientele—made it all the more interesting. Evaluative commentary on three other leadership programs noted an increase in the participants' self-confidence as one of the major program benefits. It is tempting to interpret these two findings together, and suggest that the surprise that applicants felt over being

selected was related to an unnecessarily low level of confidence in their own abilities and self-worth, although these factors improved during the program. This suggests that the audience for a leadership program cannot be counted upon to be self-nominating in most cases and that a soundly structured recruitment effort will be necessary.

Both the reviews of programs outside and the comments received within Alaska suggest it would be appropriate to seek nominations through community-based groups such as Native corporations or school boards or some other established community organizations, as well as by self-nomination. Those interviewed also stressed the need to visit communities as well as use all of the usual communication channels.

Application and Selection

Although all programs used an application form and references to make initial selections, most of the programs reviewed depended to a large extent on interviews to select applicants. Application forms varied greatly from being extremely open-ended to being very long and very specific. Perhaps some middle ground should be used. The applicant could be asked why he/she wishes to participate in such a program and how it would benefit him/her and the community in which he/she is located. Those interviewed in Alaska agreed that written information should be supplemented with an interview, although opinion was split on whether interviews should be held in the community or an institutional setting.

Commitment

Both people evaluating leadership programs outside Alaska as well as Natives with whom we talked within the state stressed the importance of commitment on the part of the staff and mentors to participants, and of the participants to the program. Particularly stressed in programs with internships was the need for those persons and agencies accepting interns to understand the program and to accept their responsibilities involving the interns. The interviews within Alaska revealed a concern that those to be selected for a leadership program must be motivated and committed to the program in that they have some idea what they expect from the program, have some well-defined personal goals or objectives, and will complete the program. Essays, interviews and past performance were all suggested as ways to assess an applicant's commitment. The principal investigator suggests that commitment on the part of the sponsoring institution will also be necessary to develop and implement a leadership training program in Alaska.

Project Staff

In considering the staff of a leadership project, the possibilities for various adjunct appointments should include those persons who are not university faculty and may not have traditionally required credentials but are skilled or experienced in Native leadership activities, Native culture and lifestyles, and other desired subject areas. Those administering the project should be comfortable in cross-cultural situations, able to work within the University structure as well as outside it, and knowledgeable about the diversity of Alaskan communities.

The Program: Individual and Group Experiences

From the programs reviewed outside Alaska as well as comments received within the state, it would appear that any program developed should be a combination of both group and individually designed experiences. Excepting one, all of the programs reviewed included some balance of individual and group participation, although emphasis and timing differed. In group experiences, a variety of interactions and exchanges took place which were considered valuable as a complement to internships or other individual activities. It is also true that providing training in a group is far less expensive than providing it for each participant. A totally individualized program may be too costly for anyone to run except on an experimental basis. Further, group interaction can be considered an

educational tool to help participants reflect on their individual reactions and to increase the rate of learning by learning from each other.

However, no program should be all group-based. Some individualization, such as through internships, allows participants to follow their own interests, specialties or skills. It also allows people of varied backgrounds, especially education levels, to participate in a program together, while pursuing on an individual basis their own needs and desires. It is not an either/or question but one of balance and integration of the two components—group and individual activity.

Those interviewed within Alaska seemed to intuitively favor a program combining group and individual opportunities. The combination was most frequently expressed in terms of the need to include both practical, "hands on" experiences and University-based coursework in a variety of suggested subjects, some specially designed and some more traditional.

Opportunity to Apply Learning

The development of a leadership program should allow for participants to apply what is learned while they are still in the program. This suggestion was made in reference to three of the programs reviewed. In the Cultural Aspects of Educational Leadership program, participants had a chance to discuss and test their ideas among their trainee group and in their placement situation, although they were far from their home locations. In the Leadership Development Program, such opportunities were limited, and this seemed to hinder later utilization of knowledge gained during the program. The LDP evaluator said that fellows often knew what to do but not how to do it. This was perhaps the rationale behind the design of the American Indian Education Leadership Development Program which allowed the participants to return periodically to the home communities to try out new ideas and then to come back to the program for further insights. A leadership program of any substantial length should plan for either periodic return to work within the home community or some other access to practical application.

Internship

Internships seemed to be an almost universally used and recommended way to individualize a leadership program while at the same time providing for the practical, on-the-job or applied aspect of leadership training that everyone we talked with deemed essential. Although the term "internship" was not necessarily agreed upon, the following ingredients were usually present: the participant was given field-based experience under the guidance of a person of some recognized expertise; the placement was decided by the participant's needs and interests; and the participant then was given certain responsibilities which allowed him/her to try out as well as learn new skills.

Among opportunities for internships or similar experiential learning placements, program developers should look at the various agencies and organizations both within the state and outside, governmental and private, which might benefit the potential leader. State government as well as Federal, and a variety of Indian and non-Indian organizations should be considered. Units within the University also might provide suitable placements, depending on the interests of the individual.

Selecting Internships

For the individual experience, whether it be an internship or some other similar means of receiving training experience in a field setting, it would be most helpful if those in charge of the project have a defined list of experiences available and have previously made arrangements for such opportunities. The participants then could choose from among a predetermined list and less time would be needed for developing the individualized portions of the program. Only one program reviewed attempted to allow each participant to design his/her own experiences without any predetermined options and, in the opinion of the evaluator of that program, this procedure was too overwhelming for many participants to cope with at the beginning of their program year. Participants, however, should not be limited by such an options list. Each year, it could be expected that the list would expand by the creativeness of the staff and participants in developing new field

placement and increasing the amount of information available on each option.

Participant/Mentor Match

Another issue in internship programs generally was the match of participant to the mentor or sponsoring agency. In most programs where the agency paid part or all of the salary during the internship experience, the mentor had either total decision-making power or substantial input into the decision-making process. In one program, the staff chose semifinalists, from among which agency mentors chose the finalists, while another brought all fellows and mentors together to match interests after the selection process had been completed. In another variation, both participants and mentors indicated choices, with the final decision controlled by a project administrator. Such matching appeared difficult and led to disappointments on both sides. The importance of bringing the participants and the mentors together early in the program, so they share a common understanding about the program, also was noted.

The principal investigator suggests that the program administrators, working with the participants, should arrange field placements. However, bringing the field supervisors or mentors together with the participant group still is a sound suggestion in determining appropriate placement if used for the purposes of giving participants further sources of information upon which to indicate their preferences while at the same time educating mentors to the program and their role.

Internships: Single or Multiple Placement

Another issue concerning the field experience portion of a leadership program was whether it was better to have one placement for the total time in the program or what was called "rotating" placements. Probably for persons who are not far along into a career or at an advanced level within their profession, a variety of placements might be a better choice, as it would allow broadening of perspectives in several career areas. There is also the consideration that some placements—for any number of reasons—may not work out, and more than one placement per participant would lessen the risk of an unsuccessful internship experience.

Cross-Cultural Experience

The program should be cognizant of the value of cross-cultural training and experiences, both those that could be developed within Alaska and those outside. The basis for this recommendation is the belief that one can reflect best on one's own cultural surroundings either by comparing it with something different or being removed from it. Any one culture is difficult to define without opportunities to contrast it and compare it with other cultures. The Native Alaskans interviewed for this study saw value in traveling outside the state to meet Indian and non-Indian persons with similar interests, whether travel took place informally, as through Army or business travel, or formally, as part of a program designed to provide that experience. The experiences noted in cross-cultural training programs at the East-West Culture Learning Institute also support this point of view, and their staff might be helpful in developing this component of an Alaskan leadership training program.

Credit

The issue of "credentialing," or providing credit or degree status for program participants, seemed to come up in every program discussion. Talking with leadership program administrators outside Alaska, the general consensus seemed to be that for those who did not already have credentials, especially among minority groups, there is a need to recognize the importance of credentials. It appeared that the only persons who were not interested in receiving credit for their participation in a leadership program were those who already had degrees or who were in mid-career positions and felt they did not need additional credentials. In one program reviewed, the participants saw to it that such a degree option was included, and in others they have requested

arrangements to receive credit for the program experience. Seldom was the issue ignored. Only the Ford-sponsored programs seemed to have held out against some sort of credit function.

Taking into account the experiences of other programs and the feeling of the Alaska Natives interviewed, the principal investigator suggests that credit should be possible, but not the primary focus of a leadership program. One could gain credit for experiences in the project or go into an optional credit experience after the project. If credit were offered through a follow-up program, various alternative routes could lead into degree programs in a subject of the participant's choosing, thereby allowing for diversity without curtailing the intent of the leadership program itself. Such follow-up alternatives could be delivered either on campus or in the field, given the new Rural Education Affairs Division of the University with its opportunities for field-based learning.

Coordination of Program Components

If a leadership program is to include various components such as academic classes, placement or field experiences, and degree options, there will be need for overall coordination. In the one program reviewed which was multi-faceted and only loosely coordinated (the National Urban Fellows Program), there appeared to be considerable misunderstanding and non-productive effort. Participants tended to be confused rather than assisted in their development of divergent, uncoordinated efforts. This need for coordination would also extend to any degree or credited follow-up experience, if it is to be partially based on the leadership program.

Coordination With Other Programs

In developing a leadership training program, it would be valuable to examine the possibility of coordinating with other similar programs, such as the one at the East-West Center, the program operated by NITRC, or even the one in Appalachia. Cooperative training arrangements and exchanges could be developed to broaden the available opportunities beyond that of any one program.

An important function of an office developing a leadership program within Alaska also should be to provide information on other available leadership programs, such as some of the ones described in this report. The office could serve as an information center on such programs, both for Alaskans seeking such experiences and for programs seeking applicants. Several of the programs described in the previous section never have had any Alaskan participants. All program staff with which the researcher talked were interested in receiving more applications from Alaska but felt they had few opportunities to make the proper contacts and that travel or recruitment trips were beyond their budgetary limitations. The cost of such an information function would be minimal, and by placing Alaskans in already established programs, the payoff could be almost immediate and substantial. It would also expand the number of Alaskans with leadership training experiences, who then might act as advisors for emerging leadership programs in Alaska and strengthen the support for such new programs.

Evaluation

Any program, even in its pilot stage—in fact, particularly at the pilot stage—needs a built-in and ongoing formative as well as summative evaluation. This means it should be evaluated in progress and at the completion, and in terms of the program as a whole as well as with regard to each individual participant. The evaluation should identify areas for improvement as well as be able to describe the program's processes and benefits to others. Programs which are not evaluated are more likely to be discontinued capriciously, as there is little evidence supporting the program and its effectiveness to be used by those who wish to see it continued. Although it is never certain to what extent program administrators will use evaluative data determining the continuation or deletion of a program, decision-making tends to be less objective when such information is not available. As was seen in the chapter which reviewed programs, leadership programs seem to come and go. Lack of solid evaluative support may be one reason this happens. To fulfill professional responsibilities to

colleagues elsewhere, an additional purpose of program evaluation is to describe the program in sufficient detail so that it could be initiated in other situations. This type of specificity also helps ensure that the program designers, participants and others within the sponsoring institution are aware of the program's goals and objectives.

Program Cost

Leadership programs which are high cost often appear to have short lives. The need for sustained funding should be carefully considered in developing any program. As was seen with Ford's Leadership Development Program, it is unlikely that a program which is too expensive to be supported by anything other than foundation funds would be continued by the University beyond the length of its initial funding. Although such funds could be sought for pilot projects, if the University or any other Alaskan organization is to develop programs which will be continued, cost must be a serious consideration. Such a program must be cost-realistic, although not necessarily comparable to classroom instruction type costs. Positive cost-benefit indicators could be a significant factor in gaining support for the continuation of a leadership training program and should be part of the evaluation effort.

Group Spirit

One leadership program evaluator suggested that the spirit of the group was generally higher the first year of the program when participants felt they were being innovative. There is an opportunity to take advantage of this finding by each year considering a slightly new thrust or direction for the program so that each group feels it is attempting something new and different; consequently, as a group, it may better succeed in its efforts. This suggestion does not necessarily need to be disruptive to program planning, as each year's program can build upon both the success and failures of the previous year's, continuing what has worked and substituting new and different things for those that did not. As part of the evaluation/replanning cycle, participants should be asked to suggest what should be continued and dropped from the program after they have experienced it.

Participant Input

Among the issues that seemed unresolved in many programs was the amount of input that program participants should have, if any, to the decision-making process. Some program developers felt that involving the participant in decision-making about their own program would be detrimental; that they did not know enough to provide this input, and that it would take away from their short learning time. Others pointed out that the participants were chosen for their leadership ability, expected to be leaders and to make decisions. Some program administrators invited participants to assist in program planning after they completed their participation, while others did allow current participants to provide input to the program direction. Some programs invited participants to help with the selection of future members. Two evaluators related this issue to the current self-determination movement among Native and minority peoples generally. There is no clear-cut answer to this issue, but it should be strongly considered before any program is launched.

Post-Program Activities

There were several post-program issues. Of the outside programs reviewed, most had a post-fellowship organization where fellows could keep in touch with each other, meet periodically to continue the sharing experience begun during the program, and support the program in various ways. In some it was as simple as sending a newsletter saying who was where, which reinforced contacts made during the project and appeared to be a valuable resource for the fellows. In others it was a more active group, national or regional, where fellows met together, put on programs and continued their training experiences. Sometimes they helped recruit new persons into the program.

Consideration should be given to some types of post-program activities, especially as they could be useful in furthering the benefits of the training experience as well as supporting a newly developing program.

Post-Program Placement

Another question which arose in terms of post-program activity was that of placement. How responsible should the program be for seeing that people either return to their home communities with negligible reentry shock, or that they be given opportunities to find new positions elsewhere? Some programs seemed to help with the reentry, some did provide placement services (although none guaranteed a job), while others did not take any responsibility for the participant after completion of training. Depending on the aims or objectives of the leadership program, the need for post-program assistance and/or placement should be considered.

FINAL NOTE

This report provides no final answer. It does, however, provide a basis for leadership program planning and development.

With special emphasis on the Alaskan context, the authors strongly urge the University to act upon the concerns for Native leadership programs expressed in this report. Hopefully, the information presented here will provide a useful base upon which to begin.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

List of Persons Who Contributed to the Study*

Outside Alaska: Persons Contributing Program Information

Ralph Bohrsen	Ford Foundation
Janet Coleson	Whitehouse Fellowship Program
Carl Daeufer	East-West Center
William Demmert	Office of Education
Douglas Derrer	Evaluation Consultant, Ford Foundation
Ron Gault	Ford Foundation
Jeff McKenna	National Indian Training & Research Center
Francis McKinley	National Indian Training & Research Center
Paul Nachtigal	Ford Foundation
Jan Raul	Institute for Educational Leadership
Paul Schindler	Institute for Educational Leadership
Charles Smith	Rockefeller Foundation
Gregory Trifonovitch	East-West Center
Richard Ungerer	Office of Education

Within Alaska: Native Leaders Interviewed

Nels Anderson, Jr.	Dillingham
Sylvia Carlsson	Anchorage
Mitch Demientieff	Nenana
Dennis Demmert	Fairbanks
Mary Jane Fate	Fairbanks
Brenda Itta	Barrow
Roger Lang	Sitka
Byron Mallot	Yakutat
Howard Rock	Fairbanks
John Sackett	Galena

Within Alaska: Those Contributing Other Information/Assistance

Margie Bauman	Freelance writer
Fred Bigjim	Alaska Methodist University
Don Dafoe	University of Alaska
Frank Darnell	University of Alaska
Eric Ekvall	Alaska Native Human Resources Development Program
Gordon Jackson	Alaska Federation of Natives
Jim Matthews	University of Alaska
Jane Maynard	Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education
Larry Neakok	City of Barrow
Emil Notti	Alaska Native Foundation
Elaine Ramos	University of Alaska
Bea Welch	Alaska Native Human Resources Development Program

* (Affiliations and locations were noted as they were at the time the persons were contacted.)

n. 46 Blank

APPENDIX B

Selected Leadership Programs and Program Directories

SELECTED LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS

American Indian Education Leadership Development Program

Ford Foundation funding is providing three years of operation beginning with 1976. The program is open to Indians and non-Indians who work in rural Indian communities filling a leadership role in Indian education, either paid or volunteer. Participants will design their own programs assisted by a mentor of their choice. Criteria for program content are that they meet individual needs and maximize growth. Stipends and expense allowances will be provided for training according to costs incurred. A subsistence allowance will be paid during periods of training.

Jerry Hill, Program Director
National Indian Training & Research Center
Suite 204
2121 South Mill Avenue
Tempe, Arizona 85282

American Indian Fellowship

Grants are available through the U.S. Office of Education to Indian students who attend or have been accepted for admission to professional degree programs in engineering, law, medicine, business, forestry, or in a field related to one of these.

U.S. Office of Education
Office of Indian Education
7th and D Streets, S.W.
Room 3514
Washington, D.C. 20202
(202) 245-7525

Coro Fellowship Program

This program provides nine-month fellowships for practical training in public affairs. Twelve positions are available in each of Coro's three training centers: San Francisco, Los Angeles, and St. Louis. Each intern will complete two public service projects while spending four days a week in the field and one day a week in seminars with fellow trainees and staff.

Applications are evaluated at each regional office following a January 15 application deadline. Twenty-four finalists from each region meet in March with a panel from the communities involved and Coro staff that makes the final selection of the thirty-six fellows.

Tuition for the program is \$2,500.00 per year. Financial aid is awarded according to need after persons are selected as fellows-elect. Scholarships, deferred payment plans, and loans are available.

A Masters in Urban Studies may be earned by completing ten weeks of intensive academic work at Occidental College in Los Angeles after the nine months' Coro training. Tuition is approximately \$1,000.00.

Coro Foundation Offices

Northern California Center
149 Ninth Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Midwest Center
4378 Lindell
St. Louis, MO 63108

Southern California Center
304 S. Broadway
Suite 344
Los Angeles, CA 90013

Eastern Recruiting Office
118 Possum Way
Murray Hill, N.J. 07974

Cultural Aspects of Educational Leadership

The program was designed to find possible ways for promoting better relations among Asian and Pacific countries and the United States through educational innovation. The program focused on the following topics: (1) *The Cultural Foundation of Education*; (2) *Educational Innovations in a Cross-Cultural Perspective*; (3) *The Role of "American" or Other Outside Culture in Societies in Transition*. Fifteen candidates are selected from countries in Asia and the Pacific and the United States.

According to recent communication, this program is being replaced in 1977-78 with a program called *Applications of Cross-Cultural Research*. It is designed to be a program for practitioners involved in applied programs for minority groups. Applications are due August, 1977. Other new programs are expected for 1979.

Director
East-West Culture Learning Institute
1777 East-West Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Education Policy Fellowship Program

This program was known formerly as Washington Internships in Education. Funding is provided by the Ford, Rockefeller and Cleveland Foundations. Mid-career individuals spend periods up to one year in policy-making positions in both Federal and state governments. The program's purpose is to train educational policy-makers to improve American education at all levels.

The program anticipates that 100 Fellows will be placed in six states and Washington, D.C., in 1977-78. Applications are due in April, 1977. Sponsor selections and final decisions are made in May-August, dependent on funding.

Education Policy Fellowship Program
Suite 310
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Graduate Psychology Training for American Indians

A new degree program at Oklahoma State University, coordinated by Ms. Weber of the Education Department and Dr. Ken Sandvold, head of Clinical Services and director of Clinical Training. The intention is to train members of recognized tribes at the Master's and Ph.D. level as mental health specialists. It is not a Native American Studies program.

Ms. Gloria Valentia Weber
Psychology American Indian Program
North Murray Hall
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

Health Career Development Program

Internships paying stipends are available for Alaska Natives who return to Alaska after completing their educations as doctors of medicine, osteopathic medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, optometry, podiatry, or pharmacists and public health specialists. Students must work in a regional health corporation, Indian Health Service Hospital Unit, or Alaska Native Medical Center.

Health Career Development Program
Alaska Federation of Natives
550 W. 8th
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

HEW College Intern Program

Students currently enrolled in degree programs from community college to graduate professional schools are eligible for participation. The program began in July, 1976. Academic backgrounds of participants could include social sciences, legislation, education, public information, administration, or science. Six students will be assigned to Washington, D.C., and Regions I, IV, VI, and X will each be assigned six students. Salaries depend on each individual's work experience and academic credit.

After an introductory seminar, students will be placed in nine-week positions where they will be encouraged to make direct contributions to HEW programs. A one-week "wrap-up" session concludes the program.

College Intern Program
Office of Personnel & Training
Department of HEW
Washington, D.C., 20201

HEW Coordinator, College Intern Program
Department of HEW
HEW Regional Office
Seattle, WA 98101

HEW Fellows Program

Twenty individuals who qualify in the G.S. range 11-15 as determined by the U.S. Civil Service Commission are assigned for one year to work with key officials in HEW. Purposes of the program are to: (1) provide opportunity and encouragement to persons who show promise of significant leadership in government or in other areas of service to the nation, (2) open the processes of government to fresh ideas, and (3) enable the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to communicate through the Fellows to their regions and thus promote better public understanding of governmental programs.

Director, HEW Fellows Program
330 Independent Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

Master of Public Health Program for Native Americans

This program, at the University of California at Berkeley, is open to all Native Americans. Begun in 1971, 57 Native Americans have enrolled, 26 graduated, and 26 are still enrolled and working toward their degrees. The program is designed to meet both the needs of the students and

the needs of Native American communities for highly trained health specialists.

Ms. Elaine Walbroek
Director
Master of Public Health Program
for Native Americans
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

National Urban Fellows, Inc.

With emphasis on members of minority groups and women, persons between 25 and 40 are trained through a combination of formal education and field experience to increase their abilities as competent urban administrators. The program, now in its eighth year, begins with a short intensive summer session at the Yale University campus. Fellows who successfully complete the summer session are assigned for nine months as special assistants to urban administrators who serve as mentors.

Persons accepted as Fellows become candidates for the Master of Arts in Urban Studies degree at Occidental College. Degree completion requires a ten-week residential semester at the College at the end of the fellowship year.

Applications will be accepted in July, 1977.

Louis Alvarez, Executive Director
National Urban Fellows, Inc.
246 Church Street
New Haven, CT 06510
(203) 624-5168

The Native American Administrator's Program

Since 1970, Pennsylvania State University has worked with various Native American tribal groups and institutions to prepare professionals for administrative and policy-making positions in tribal organizations, Indian institutions, Federal and public schools, and Federal and state governments. A limited number of doctoral candidates are funded each year.

The program is currently seeking candidates for fall term, 1977.

Dr. Gerald E. Gipp
Director, Native American Program
The Pennsylvania State University
403 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 856-1487

Public Service Science Internships

Internships are offered by the National Science Foundation only to persons who are enrolled in undergraduate or graduate-level programs in the mathematical, physical, biological, medical, engineering, or social sciences. Applicants must have completed three years of undergraduate study with a major in science or engineering by the time they expect to begin their internships, and must be enrolled in an accredited educational institution at the time of application.

Internships may range between six months and twelve months. Applicants are responsible for making their own arrangements with an appropriate host organization or institution. Priority is given to applications from interns proposing to associate themselves with host institutions that normally do not have access to scientific expertise.

Public Service Science Internships
Office of Science and Society
National Science Foundation
Washington, D.C. 20550

Rockefeller Administrative Internship Program

Founded in 1972 under the sponsorship of the Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, the program provides minority teachers with intensive administrative training and experiences to enable them to move into mid-level administrative positions. While enrolled in university courses leading to administrative credentials and/or a Master's or Doctoral degree, the intern participates in a two-phase field experience. The first phase provides a broad base of administrative experience and the second phase is an in-depth experience with one or two administrative areas.

Victor M. Resendez, Ph.D.
Director, Administrative Intern Program
Office of the Los Angeles County
Superintendent of Schools
9300 East Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 94242

Superintendent's Training Program, Rockefeller Foundation Fellows

The program's goal is to prepare experienced minority administrators for high-level duties. Interns spend one year gaining experience in several settings and return to more responsible administrative positions in their home school systems.

Bruce E. Williams
The Rockefeller Foundation
111 West 50th Street
New York City, New York 10020

Technology Program for American Indians

Funded by the Hearst Foundation and the BIA, this program at Oklahoma State University provides a four-year education in technology to Native Americans. Beginning with an eight-week introduction session between high school graduation and their freshman year, the program provides summer jobs in the participant's chosen career field as well as regular academic training. Once it is fully funded all tuition, books, and room and board will be covered. OSU offers technical degrees in aeronautical, electrical power, electronics, construction management, fire protection and safety, mechanical power, mechanical design, petroleum, radiation and nuclear power, and general technologies.

Dr. Ken Anderson
215 Crutchfield Hall
School of Technology
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

The White House Fellowships

People between the ages of 23 and 36 who have completed their educations and have begun

their careers are brought together for one year in Washington, D.C., and assigned as special assistants to Cabinet members, the Vice President, or to the heads of independent Executive Branch agencies for the purpose of gaining firsthand experience in the process of governing.

Applications are initially screened in Washington by the Commission on White House Fellowships. Selected applicants are interviewed by Regional Selection Panels in eleven geographic areas of the United States. Finalists are invited to Washington to meet with the Commission which makes its recommendations to the President who appoints approximately 30 new fellows.

Salaries of up to \$31,806 for the year are available depending on each fellow's education, experience and previous earnings.

Applications are due in the fall.

President's Commission
on White House Fellowships
Washington, D.C. 20415

PROGRAM DIRECTORIES

Director of Public Service Internships: Opportunities for the Graduate, Post Graduate, and Mid-Career Professional, 1976-77. National Center for Public Service Internship Programs. Suite 610, 1735 Eye Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

This edition includes over thirty mid-career and one hundred pre-professional internships and fellowship opportunities in the United States. Also included is an extensive bibliography and a section listing state and regional clearinghouses for internship information.

The Directory is \$3.00 for members and \$6.00 for nonmembers.

The Directory of Undergraduate Internship Programs in the Public Sector. National Center for Public Service Internship Programs. Suite 610, 1735 Eye Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

The Directory lists nationwide internship opportunities and includes information about program design, admission requirements, remuneration and academic credit.

The Directory is \$3.00 for members and \$6.00 for nonmembers.

Directory of Washington Internships, 1976-77. National Center for Public Service Internship Programs. Suite 610, 1735 Eye Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

Internships available in the metropolitan area during the Bicentennial year for people from high school students to mid-career professionals are listed. Each listing includes a description of the organization and objectives of the program and the skills required by applicants as well as the time frames and stipend arrangements available.

The Directory is \$3.00 for members and \$6.00 for nonmembers.

A Selected List of Major Fellowship Opportunities and Aids to Advanced Education for United States Citizens. Spring 1974. Prepared by the Fellowship Office, Commission on Human Resources, National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20418, under contract with the National Science Foundation.

This annotated, alphabetical list of fellowships available from both public and private sources, is arranged in three parts according to the educational attainment of the intended recipients: undergraduate, graduate or postdoctoral. The list's scope is broad, including internships, fellowships, scholarships and other types of programs. A bibliography containing twenty-three publications of more complete listings of fellowships, scholarships and student loans is included.

Where to Look, A Source Book on Undergraduate Internships, by Joy Hecht. 1975. American Association of Higher Education, 1 Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A guide for students exploring the first steps of finding an internship program, this twenty-page booklet was written for undergraduates by an undergraduate intern. It includes sections on campus resources, various internship opportunities, and a bibliography of internship program directories.

The Source Book is \$2.00 for members and \$3.00 for nonmembers.

APPENDIX C

Interview Schedule and Initial Contact Letter

Interview Schedule

EDUCATION/WORK EXPERIENCE

- A. What type of schools did you attend (elementary, secondary, post-secondary)?
- B. What obstacles, if any, did you encounter in your education?
- C. Briefly describe your work history.
- D. What obstacles, if any, have you had in your work experience?
- E. Where there any persons or experiences in your education or work history which contributed to your obtaining career aspirations and leadership ability?
- F. Are there any other experiences, such as travel, military, etc., which helped you in attaining your position in the Native community?
- G. In your opinion, are there any necessary characteristics a leader must have?

RECRUITMENT AND APPLICATION

- A. Are there any existing organizations or methods which could be used for recruiting program participants?
- B. What kinds of things might prevent a person from applying to a Native Leadership Program?
- C. Besides the normal personal history information, and asking why the applicant wants to participate in the program, do we need anything else on an application form?
- D. Would you require letters of recommendation for applicants?
 1. Would you accept letters of recommendation alone as an alternative way to select participants?

SELECTION

- A. Would a personal interview be necessary for candidate selection?
- B. If a personal interview is necessary, would you:
 1. Conduct it in an an applicant's town or village, or bring applicants to a central interview location?
 2. Who should conduct the interviews?
- C. Which of the following would you set as minimal education requirements for program participants: (You may choose more than one)
 1. None

2. The ability to read and write English
 3. A high school diploma
 4. Two years of post-secondary education
 5. A Bachelor's degree
 6. Other
- D. What age limits would you set for program participants?
- E. Who do you feel are the Alaskan Natives that might benefit most from a leadership program (what types of people)?
- F. Are there any other ways to identify Alaskan Natives who'd benefit from a leadership program?

PLANNING AND EVALUATION

- A. Who should serve on a planning committee for the training program?
- B. How would you evaluate a Native Leadership Program?

CREDENTIALING AND CREDIT

- A. Should a Native Leadership Program offer academic credit?
- B. Are there any particular academic fields the program should include?

STRUCTURE AND CONTENT

- A. Would you emphasize course work, or internships and work experience, or a combination of the two in a leadership program? (If a "combination," in what proportions?)
- B. What specific courses, if any, should be included in a leadership program?
- C. Are there any specific internships or work experiences which should be included in the program?
- D. Should most program activities be individual or group experiences?
- E. Are there any other program activities you would recommend?
- F. How long should a leadership program last?
- G. Is there any best time of year to offer leadership training?
- H. Should there be flexible entry and/or exit to the program, or should a group start and finish together?

COSTS

A. What percent of the total costs should be paid by the following organizations?

- | | |
|---|---------|
| 1. University of Alaska | _____ % |
| 2. Program participants | _____ % |
| 3. Federal Government | _____ % |
| 4. Native corporations and/or associations | _____ % |
| 5. Other sources (private grants, etc., please specify) | _____ % |

SUMMARY

- A. In your own words, describe the goals of a Native Leadership Program.
- B. In your opinion, have previous leadership programs benefited the people involved?
- C. Do you think the questions in this interview will help develop a useful Native Leadership Program?
- D. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that might make a University-sponsored leadership program more effective?

(Initial Contact Letter)

Dear

My name is Bob Fox and I'm a student research assistant at the Center for Northern Educational Research, University of Alaska, Fairbanks. I am working with Dr. Kathryn A. Hecht on a Title I Higher Education research grant to gather information for planning a University-sponsored Native Leadership Development Program.

While we are investigating other leadership programs throughout the United States, we have no set ideas in mind for the University's leadership program. As a Native leader, your help in planning such a program would provide valuable insights. Therefore, I would appreciate interviewing you in the near future. I will call you in the next few days to confirm an interview date.

Sincerely,

Bob Fox
Center for Northern Education Research
University of Alaska
Fairbanks, Alaska
479-7173

BF:ds